

The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh–Twelfth Centuries

CHARLES M. BRAND

Πύργον γὰρ σε τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας ἀκράδαντον λογιζόμενος. . . .

Michael Italikos, Letter to John Axouchos

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Byzantine Empire retained its power to attract and incorporate individuals of other nationalities, including Armenians, Hungarians, Bulgarians, and Westerners. Membership in the aristocracy, that is, those granted court titles and connected with the ruling dynasty by blood or marriage, was open to native-born and foreigner alike. For prudential reasons, rulers frequently sought to introduce outsiders into this elite.

Modern scholars, often writing from the perspective of the nationality in question, have investigated the foreigners who entered Byzantium, especially those who joined the aristocracy. One group, however, has been noted only in passing: the Turks. The barriers which hindered Turkish integration into Byzantium were formidable: Greeks and Turks have very different languages; Islam was not an acceptable religion for a Byzantine; the style of life of the Turkish raider contrasted markedly with that of the Byzantine subject; Turks would seem to have been mortal enemies of the Byzantines. This Greco-Turkish hostility was probably the least important of these hindrances in an eleventh-twelfth century context, when no enmity was viewed as permanent. Malikshah, son of the Turkish victor at Mantzikert, negotiated with Michael VII and twice suggested a marriage alliance to Alexius I.¹ Kilidj Arslan II

made peace with Manuel and paid a state visit to Constantinople.² But the barriers of language, religion, and manner of life were serious ones. That a significant number of Turks made the transition proves that Byzantium had not exhausted its power to attract and absorb.

This study concentrates on those Turks who came from the East through Anatolia to enter imperial service. Byzantine authors had long applied the name “Tourkoi” to a variety of Asian peoples, including the Magyars and Khazars;³ to include members of every such group would enlarge this

historical work. The spelling of personal names has occasioned difficulties; I have generally retained Byzantine spelling for Turks who entered Byzantine service, while giving Turkish equivalents at their first appearance. In spelling Turkish names, a compromise between *EP*² and Setton’s *History of the Crusades* has been attempted. The word “Perses” has normally been rendered as “Turk.”

I thank Bryn Mawr College for a sabbatical, part of which was used to write this paper. In the final stages of preparation, I benefited from the library of Dumbarton Oaks; I am grateful for a Fellowship there in the spring of 1988. Thanks go to Prof. Stephen Salsbury for editorial assistance, and very special thanks to my wife for copy-reading the manuscript. I am also grateful to the secretaries at Bryn Mawr College, Lorraine Kirschner, Deanne Bell, and Bunnie King, who typed a most difficult manuscript. Other debts will be acknowledged in appropriate places.

¹Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten, CFHB 11 (Berlin, 1975), 118–21 (all citations are to vol. I); John Kinnamos, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio [sic] Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke, Bonn ed. (1836), 204–8.

²G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*² (Berlin, 1958) (hereafter *BT*), II, 320–27, reviews the principal usages. The so-called Vardariote Turks were probably Hungarian: see Nicolas Oikonomides, “Vardariotes—W.l.nd.r—V.n.nd.r: Hongrois installés dans la vallée du Vardar en 934,” in his *Documents et études sur les institutions de Byzance (VIIe–XVe s.)* (London, 1976), Part XXII, with a review of the previous bibliography.

¹On Michael VII, see P. Gautier, “Lettre au sultan Malik-Shah, rédigée par Michel Psellos,” *REB* 35 (1977), 73–97, with anterior bibliography. On Alexius I, see Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, ed. B. Leib (Paris, 1937–45), II, 65, 75–76.

It may seem rash for a non-Turkophone to attempt a study of Turks, but there are no Turkish sources for this period. I am indebted to Aslı Özyar for assistance with a modern Turkish

paper's scope to an unmanageable degree. While the numerous anonymous Turks who immigrated or were brought captive into the Byzantine Empire will be briefly mentioned, the purpose of this study is to examine the integration of Turks into the Byzantine ruling class, from the mid-eleventh century, when Turks first made serious inroads into Byzantine Anatolia, until the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204.

The paper commences with biographical sketches of the careers of known Turks, considers briefly some questionable cases, and glances at some Turkish leaders who temporarily sought refuge in Byzantium. Using this body of factual information, I will investigate the reasons why Turks entered Byzantine service, the questions of conversion, mechanisms of assimilation, and problems which confronted Turks who joined the Byzantine upper class. In a few cases one can follow a Turk's descendants for several generations and examine the extent of their integration into Byzantium. The attitudes of other Byzantines about the Turkish incomers will also prove of interest: anti-Latin feeling is well known in twelfth-century Byzantium, but anti-Turkish sentiments have only begun to arouse notice.

As early as the tenth century companies of Turks entered Byzantine service; Constantine Porphyrogenitus mentions Turks from Fergana in the palace guard.⁴ But only after the advent of Seljuk raiders on the eastern frontier did Turkish individuals and bands begin to appear regularly in Byzantine service.⁵

The first of this group was called Amertikes by Attaleiates; Cahen suggests "Amir . . ." or "Khumartekin" as his original name, but identifies him as Harun, son of a Turkish khan, and alludes to him as Ibn Khan. Attaleiates says he boasted royal descent. He first appeared in Byzantium, apparently as a refugee, in the reign of Michael VI (1056–57), and was received with high honor.

⁴Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo*, ed. J. Reiske, Bonn ed., I (1829), 576; II (1830), 674–75. J. Laurent, *Byzance et les Turcs seldjoucides dans l'Asie occidentale jusqu'en 1081* (Nancy, 1913), 15 note 1.

⁵For general surveys of the Turks and Byzantium in the 11th–12th centuries, see J. Laurent's work cited above; K. Amantos, *Σχέσεις Ἑλλήνων καὶ Τούρκων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνδεκατοῦ αἰῶνος μέχρι τοῦ 1821*, I (Athens, 1955), 19–45; S. Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, 1971), 69–286 (hereafter Vryonis, *Asia Minor*).

Seemingly, he served Isaac I, but then attempted to assassinate Constantine X. Therefore, he was exiled, only to be recalled by Constantine and sent against the Turks in the Diyarbakr region. Because ca. 1063/4, the pay of his troops was suppressed, he transferred his allegiance to the ruler of Aleppo. In the reign of Eudokia (1067) he joined the Turks who had pillaged the eastern themes; in the following year he fought Romanus IV in the region of Membij.⁶

In 1070 Manuel Comnenus, eldest brother of the future emperor Alexius I, was captured by a Turkish leader whom the Byzantines called Chrysoskoulos, apparently Arisighi or Erisgen, brother-in-law of Sultan Alp Arslan. Chrysoskoulos, who was at odds with the sultan, anticipated the arrival of a Turkish army too strong for him to oppose. With little difficulty, Manuel Comnenus persuaded him to change sides, and had the pleasure of returning to Romanus IV leading his former captor as a voluntary adherent to Byzantium. Accorded splendid gifts, Chrysoskoulos received the title of proedros. In 1071 he accompanied the emperor's expedition to Mantzikert, but his activities in this disastrous campaign are unknown. He remained in Byzantine service, however, for in 1078 he acted as intermediary between Nicephorus Botaneiates, then seeking to usurp the throne, and Sulayman ibn Kutlumush, leader of the Turks in Bithynia.⁷

During the reign of Nicephorus III Botaneiates (1078–81), a Byzantine general captured a young Turkish raider of undistinguished birth whom the Byzantines called Tzachas (from Turkish Çaka, Chaka, or Çaqan). His exploits must have been well known, for, when he was brought to Constantinople, the emperor offered him the title of pro-

⁶Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn ed. (1853), 94–95, 108–9; Ἡ συνέχεια τῆς Χρονογραφίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτζου (*Ioannes Skylitzes Continuatus*), ed. E. Tsolakes (Thessalonike, 1968) (hereafter *Skylitzes Cont.*), 120, follows Attaleiates closely; C. Cahen, "La première pénétration turque en Asie-Mineure (seconde moitié du XI^e s.)," in his *Turcobyzantina et Oriens Christianus* (London, 1974), Part I, 26 and note 2, who utilizes unpublished Arabic chronicles to identify and date Amertikes' career; C. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, trans. J. Jones-Williams (from a still-unpublished French text) (New York, 1968), 27–28 (where he calls him Ibn Khan); Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 66, has no suggestion about the origin of the Greek name.

⁷Nicephorus Bryennios, *Historiarum libri quattuor*, ed. P. Gautier, CFHB 9 (Brussels, 1975), 101–3, 239–41; *Skylitzes Cont.*, 141–42, who notes the youth, short stature, and dark, ill-favored appearance of Chrysoskoulos; J. Laurent, "Byzance et les origines du sultanat de Roum," *Mélanges Charles Diehl* (Paris, 1930), I, 178; Cahen, "Première pénétration," 27–28 (esp. 27 note 3), 43.

tonobellisimos and rich gifts. In return, Tzachas pledged his loyalty to the emperor. He apparently passed some time at court, for later he was able to call Constantine Dalassenos by name and felt no hesitation in proposing a marriage alliance between their families. But, Tzachas declared, when Alexius I came to the throne (1081), he lost everything. He then struck out on his own, using Smyrna as a base and gaining support from Christian shipwrights who constructed a fleet for him. His career as a pirate-emir, acting in cooperation with the Petchenegs, need not concern us. Ca. 1091 he claimed the title of emperor, used the imperial symbols, and planned to occupy the throne in Constantinople. A year or more later, Alexius convinced Kilidj Arslan I of Nikaia that Tzachas was really aspiring to the sultanate. Under pretense of friendship, Kilidj Arslan inveigled Tzachas into his camp at Abydos and killed him.⁸

The first Turk to achieve a position of high command in Byzantine service was Tatikios. His father had been a “Saracen” taken by John Comnenus,

father of Alexius I. By “Saracen” Anna Comnena probably means a Turk, since the Turks were the principal Muslim foes of the empire in the 1050s and the most likely to be captured. Tatikios must have been born around 1057 and perhaps was seized as a child, because Crusader sources say his nose had been cut off. He was the same age as Alexius I and was nurtured alongside him. Growing up with Alexius, he became one of his most trusted generals and a member of his personal entourage. Tatikios first appears as a scout during Alexius’ campaign against Basilakes, ca. 1078. After Alexius’ coronation, he became grand primikerios; while there had been primikerioi of the court, Alexius seems to have invented this title for Tatikios. During the first campaign against the Normans (1081), Tatikios commanded the “Turks living around Ochrida,” presumably descendants of the “Turks of the Vardar,” who seem to have been Hungarians. From 1086 to 1095, he appears repeatedly, fighting the Petchenegs and the Turks who held Nikaia. Usually he was successful, and Anna Comnena praises his skill and foresight. Late in 1094, he participated in the Synod of Blachernai, with the title “Protoproedros and Grand Primikerios of the Inner Vestiarites.” In the same year, he was responsible for frustrating the conspiracy of Nicephorus Diogenes, one of the most dangerous Alexius faced. As a guard outside the emperor’s bathhouse, and later outside Alexius’ tent, he prevented Diogenes from reaching the emperor. In 1097, after participating in the siege of Nikaia by the Byzantines and Crusaders, he was sent to accompany the First Crusade across Anatolia. He commanded a Byzantine force, acted as guide, and as Alexius’ representative received places recovered from the Turks. At the siege of Antioch, in January or February 1198, according to Anna Comnena, Tatikios was deceived by Bohemund into leaving the army; she acknowledges he was also in despair over the famine and the grim outlook. Crusader sources blame his cowardice, but J. France argues that Tatikios had quarreled with both Bohemund and Raymond of St. Gilles, so that his position in the army became untenable. He departed on the pretext of finding food for the starving army, and may actually have arranged food shipments. His explanation apparently satisfied Alexius, for in 1099 the emperor appointed him to a naval command against a Pisan fleet. Thereafter, he disappears from history. A nephew, Constantine, served as tax-surveyor with the title

⁸The details of Tzachas’ career discussed in the text are found in Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 114, 157–58, 165–66; other aspects of his career can be followed through Anna’s *Alexiad*: see vol. IV (Index, by P. Gautier, Paris, 1976), 128. The question of when Kilidj Arslan wedded the daughter of Tzachas (*Alexiad*, III, 13) cannot be solved. Anna Comnena, II, 165, speaks of the sultan as already son-in-law of Tzachas at the time of the coup at Abydos, but she may have been writing anachronistically. Anna is explicit that Tzachas was slain at Abydos; the “Tzachas” whom John Doukas rather easily expelled from Smyrna in 1097 (*Alexiad*, III, 23–25) was probably a son—Byzantine and western authors easily confused Muslim names and patronymics: S. Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, I (Cambridge, 1951), 77 note 1. John Zonaras, *Epitome historiarum*, Bonn ed., III, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst (1897), 736–37, stresses Tzachas’ undistinguished origin. There is a brief mention of him as Tzakatzas in Michael Glykas, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn ed. (1836), 620.

On Tzachas, see A. N. Kurat, *Çaka Bey: İzmir ve civarındaki adaların ilk Türk Beyi, M.S. 1081–1096* (Ankara, 1966), 34–35, 39, 51 (I am grateful to Aslı Özyar, a graduate student in Bryn Mawr’s Archaeology Department, who read this work and discussed it with me); Vryonis, *Asia Minor*, 211; H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer* (Paris, 1966), 184–86; I. Mélikoff, Introduction to *La geste de Melik Danişmend* (Paris, 1960), I, 85–88, 122. The most recent work is A. G. K. Savvides, ‘Ο Σελτζούκος ἐμίσης τῆς Σμύρνης Τζαχάς (Çaka) καὶ οἱ ἐπιδρομὲς του στὰ Μικρασιατικὰ παραλία, τὰ Νησιά τοῦ ἀνατολικοῦ Αἰγαίου καὶ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολη (c. 1081–c. 1106), *Χιακὰ Χρονικά* 14 (1982), 9–24; 16 (1984), 51–66 (the second portion of this article is not available to me). Savvides, 14:13, proposes a drastic reorganization of Tzachas’ career, based on the thesis that Anna Comnena totally misdated and misorganized her material; his proof seems to be the references to a “Tzachas” in the *Danişmendname* (see the edition by Mélikoff, above). This work, however, is of late composition and legendary content. To abandon the data offered by a contemporary historian in favor of the material in the *Danişmendname* appears unjustified.

kouropalates and asekretes sometime before 1104. Tatikios apparently left descendants; a grandson seemingly married a Comnena, and the offspring of that union apparently included the Constantine Tatikios who plotted against Isaac II at the end of the twelfth century.⁹

Ca. 1086, after Alexius' defeat of the Normans, the Seljuk sultan of Persia, Malikshah, dispatched an ambassador to seek a treaty with Byzantium. The envoy, whom Anna calls Siaous (i.e., čauš or messenger), asked for a marriage alliance and offered the return of cities occupied by the Turks. "Siaous" possessed a letter from the sultan directing Turkish commanders to surrender their cities. It was to be used if Alexius accepted the marriage alliance. Alexius, anxious to utilize the letter, and impressed with "Siaous'" abilities, discovered that he had been born of a Turkish father and a Georgian mother. The emperor persuaded him to change sides. "Siaous" used his letter to induce the Turkish commander in Sinope to yield that city and others, then returned to Constantinople. He was baptized and presented with gifts, then ap-

pointed doux of Anchialos, far from the Turkish-Byzantine frontier.¹⁰

In 1092–93, during a period of confusion among the Turks of Bithynia, the region of Kyzikos and Apollonia, west of Brusa, fell into the hands of an Elchanes or Il-Khan. Anna Comnena has again taken a Turkish title for a name. Pressed by Constantine Opos, Elchanes surrendered, became Christian, gained numerous gifts, and took service under the emperor. Elchanes was accompanied by members of his family, and shortly thereafter, when his followers Skaliarios and another, whose name Anna Comnena left blank as she wrote, learned of the rich rewards Elchanes had obtained, they too entered Byzantine service. The unnamed individual received the rank of hyperperilampros. Skaliarios and apparently Elchanes participated in the war with the Cumans in 1094–95. At that time, they were under the command of Tatikios. In 1108, in the struggle with Bohemund, Anna Comnena records the death of "Skaliarios, a Turk who was formerly of the most distinguished leaders in the East, who went over to the emperor and received holy baptism."¹¹

In 1097, during the siege of Nikaia, the crusaders captured a Turkish lad named Axouch, whom they presented to Alexius. Since he was ten, the same age as John, the heir to the throne, Alexius made Axouch or John Axouchos his son's companion. The two youths grew up as the closest of friends, and John Axouchos remained throughout his life devoted to the Comneni. When John acceded to the throne in 1118, Axouchos became grand domestikos or commander of the eastern and western armies. So great was his power that even the emperor's relatives, meeting him, would dismount from their horses to do him reverence. His abilities in warfare were equaled by his liberality and benevolence. At the outset of John II's reign, when Anna Comnena's property was confiscated, after her conspiracy in behalf of her husband, Nicephorus Bryennios, it was awarded to

⁹Tatikios is first mentioned in Bryennios, *Hist.*, 287–89; Anna Comnena is especially full on his life: *Alexiad.*, I, 151; II, 67–72, 83–86, 97, 109, 171, 182, 193; III, 12–13, 17–18, 20–21, 40–45. For his title in 1094, see P. Gautier, "Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094): Etude prosopographique," *REB* 29 (1971), 218. The principal Crusader narratives about him are the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*, ed. R. Hill [and R. Mynors] (London, 1962), 34–35; Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber*, ed. J. H. and L. L. Hill, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades* (hereafter DHC) 9 (Paris, 1969), 54–56; Petrus Tudebodus, *Historia de hierosolymitano itinere*, ed. J. H. and L. L. Hill, DHC 12 (Paris, 1977), 69–70. Sources based largely on these accounts are Baudry of Dol, *Historia*, RHC HOcc, IV (Paris, 1879), 44–45; Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, RHC HOcc, IV, 175–76; Albert of Aix, *Historia*, RHC HOcc, IV, 315; William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, RHC HOcc, I (Paris, 1844), 107–8, 186–87, 252; see the new ed. by R. B. C. Huygens, under the title *Willelmi tyrensis archiepiscopi Chronicon/Guillaume de Tyr Chronique*, *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis*, 63–63A (Turnhout, 1986), I, 193, 262–63, 321. On Tatikios' nephew, see P. Lemerle, ed., *Actes de Lavra*, *Archives de l'Athos* 5, I (Paris, 1970), 292.23–24, 28; the text merely says "nephew of the grand primikerios," but no other bearer of the title is known at that era: R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* (Berlin, 1967), I, 307, 312–15. Dumbarton Oaks possesses two lead seals (nos. 58.106.2183 and 58.106.4145) of a Constantine "Tatekios" or "Tatekes," protobellissimos, both dated 11/12th centuries; I am grateful to John Nesbitt, who confirmed the reading of these seals. On Tatikios' descendants, see Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 423, and the proposed genealogy in K. Barzos, "Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν (hereafter Barzos, Γεν.) (Thessalonike, 1984), II, 254 note 38. The major article about Tatikios is J. France, "The Departure of Tatikios from the Crusader Army," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 44 (1971), 137–47, but there are sketches of his career in Guiland (see above), Gautier, "Synode des Blachernes," 252–54, and B. Skoulatos, *Les personnages byzantins de l'Alexiade* (Louvain, 1980), 287–92.

¹⁰Anna Comnena, *Alexiad.*, II, 65–66; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 274; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 280–81.

¹¹Anna Comnena, *Alexiad.*, II, 79–81, 193; III, 105 (whence the quotation). I have tentatively accepted the reading of II, 193.28 proposed by G. Buckler and H. Grégoire, *Byzantion* 4 (1927/28), 692. The Elchanes mentioned in *Alexiad.*, II, 211.2, as serving Kilidj Arslan I against Peter the Hermit was probably another person, since the title is not uncommon. Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 281, has a brief biography of Skaliarios. On Elchanes, see Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 124, and Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 81. Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 277, has no explanation for the name "Skaliarios."

Axouchos. The wise Turk successfully petitioned the emperor to return her wealth to Anna. Thereby he not only strengthened his reputation but avoided alienating an important branch of the Comneni.¹²

Since the reign of John II is only briefly dealt with by the historians Kinnamos and Nicetas Choniates, and dimly illuminated by contemporary poets and orators, we have few details of John Axouchos' activities in this period. In 1119 he participated in an attack on Laodikeia on the Lykos. An oration shows that Axouchos was wounded in the leg or foot in 1122, in battle with the Petchenegs; John II was deeply grieved thereby. Axouchos also participated in the campaign against Cilicia, Antioch, and northern Syria in 1137–38, and was again wounded. During his absence, Michael Italikos, a rhetorician and teacher in Constantinople, wrote Axouchos first to request his support against those who were slandering Italikos, and again to thank him for his effectual intercession with the emperor.¹³

Axouchos accompanied John II on his final campaign into Cilicia, and was at his side at the time of John's death, April 1143. He was evidently consulted by John about the succession; after the designation of Manuel, Axouchos organized the army to pledge allegiance to the new emperor. Immediately after John's death, Manuel placed his future in the hands of John Axouchos and Chartoularios Basil Tzintziloukes. They were sent to Constantinople to secure the imperial palace and prevent opposition from forming. John, who was clearly the leader of this mission, was eminently successful: the envoys outstripped the news of John's death, and seized Manuel's principal potential opponents, his brother Isaac and his brother-in-law

John Rogerios. Axouchos also had available chrysobulls of increasing generosity to use to win the support of the clergy of Haghia Sophia, but only needed the least costly one. In short, he very efficiently carried out his mission.¹⁴

The grand domestikos continued to be extremely active in the early years of Manuel's reign. He participated in the attack on Ikonion in 1146, and during the retreat, while the Byzantine army was hard pressed by Turkish forces, he tried to restrain Manuel's personal rashness. As we shall see below, there is reason to believe Axouchos was involved in checking the armies of the Second Crusade, ca. 1147. In the following year, he was appointed to command of the infantry used in the attack on the Normans who held the fortress of Kerkyra or Corfu. When the admiral Stephen Kontostephanos was killed, Axouchos assumed command until the emperor's arrival. During the siege, a riot broke out between the Byzantine troops and their allies, the Venetians. After attempting mediation, Axouchos sent his personal guards, apparently a substantial and stalwart body, and then some regular troops, who suppressed the trouble. After the recovery of Kerkyra, John Axouchos seems to have been given command of a fleet with a mission to go to Ancona. But he never got beyond the river Vjosë in Albania; Kinnamos suggests that he was hindered from proceeding either by lack of naval experience or by advice from the Venetians, who did not desire a restoration of Byzantine power in Italy. Allegedly, the fleet suffered severe losses in a storm. In late 1149 or 1150, Axouchos was sent back to Constantinople, nominally to report on Manuel's victories in the western Balkans. He does not again appear in history; in 1150 he would have been about sixty-three, then a fairly ripe age for an active man.¹⁵

John Axouchos was apparently well educated, with a good understanding of the rhetorical, clas-

¹² Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 9–11; Nicephorus Basilakes, *Oration to John Axouchos, Orationes et Epistolae*, ed. A. Garzya (Leipzig, 1984), 85–88, stresses the close companionship of Axouchos and the future emperor, and how Axouchos served as the prickly *akanthos* (a pun on his name) to bloody the hands of John's opponents. This oration was composed between 1138 (the end of John's first Syrian campaign) and John's death in 1143, presumably before John's departure in 1142. Axouchos' name is given as both "Axouch" and "Axouchos." I have chosen the Hellenized form. Axouchos was entitled "sebastos"; the "protosebastos" applied to him in a manuscript heading is probably an error: A. P. Kazhdan, *Sotsial'nyi sostav gosподstvennischego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow, 1974), 112 and note 28.

¹³ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 5–6; Basilakes, *Orationes*, 89–91; Michael Italikos, *Lettres et discours*, ed. P. Gautier (Paris, 1972), 222–24 (no. 37), 228–30 (no. 39)—clearly, no. 39 preceded no. 37. Italikos' no. 39 also shows that Axouchos had campaigned on and beyond the Danube (probably in John's Hungarian wars) and toward the Tigris against the "Parthians" and "Medes" (i.e., Turks).

¹⁴ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 41, 46, 48–49; Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 31–32, 37–38, avoids mentioning Axouchos by name in giving an account of these events. William of Tyre, *Hist.*, RHC HOcc, I, 695 (ed. Huygens, II, 705), suggests that Axouchos had supported Isaac for the succession, but this seems unlikely: Manuel would not have entrusted such a delicate mission to Axouchos if there had been any hint of lack of devotion. William wrote many years after these events, and had imperfect sources of information; he even gives the year of John II's death as 1137!

¹⁵ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 47, 51, 102, 113; Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 77, 82, 85–86, 90. At the time of their deaths, Alexius I was about 61, John II, 55, and Manuel I, 61. P. Magdalino, "Isaac *sebastokrator* (III), John Axouch, and a Case of Mistaken Identity," *BMGS* 11 (1987), 207–14 has argued that the "grand stratarchos" who joined Isaac the Sebastokrator (Manuel's

sicizing Greek used by intellectuals of the day. During the eastern campaign of 1137–38, he received and understood Michael Italikos' elaborate letters, and acted in Italikos' favor. After that campaign, Nicephorus Basilakes addressed to him a lengthy oration, a good part of which is devoted to praise of John II, but which also depicts their mutual devotion in very attractive terms. About 1147 Axouchos posed questions to the theologian Nicholas of Methone as to how the Holy Spirit could *substantially* (*ousiodos*) visit and indwell the apostles, as Gregory of Nazianzen had stated, and, if this indwelling was in the same fashion as in Christ, why the apostles were not called *christoi*, and if not, how did it differ. Nicholas delayed a response until a directive from Manuel specifically required him to resolve Axouchos' inquiries. Nicholas noted that at the time, Axouchos was preoccupied with "the danger which hangs over all of us from the advance of all the western nations," evidently a reference to the Second Crusade. The theologian produced a short treatise to answer Axouchos' questions.¹⁶

Apparently, John Axouchos married about the time of John II's accession; his eldest son, Alexius, is believed to have been born around 1120, and a

daughter, Irene, around 1121. Since Alexius is specified to have been the eldest son, there were one or more additional sons. Another daughter, Eudokia, was born much later, around 1135, possibly from a second wife. Ca. 1135 Irene was betrothed to Alexius Comnenus, a grandson of Alexius I's brother Isaac Comnenus the Sebastokrator, but Alexius died before the wedding occurred. Ca. 1150 Eudokia was betrothed to Stephen Comnenus, also a grandson of Isaac the Sebastokrator, and thus a cousin of the late Alexius. Since it was forbidden for sisters to marry first cousins, the synod heard the case and permitted Eudokia's marriage, because Irene's betrothal did not constitute a marriage.¹⁷

Sometime in the late eleventh or first half of the twelfth century, there arrived in Byzantium a refugee who was, or claimed to be, a member of the ruling Seljuk house of Nikaia and Ikonion, which descended from Kutlumush or Kutalmish. He was known by the Byzantines as Koutlounousios. All that can be said about him is that he became a Christian and founded a monastery on Mount Athos, to which he presumably retired. The monastery is first attested in 1169, by the signature of its abbot on a charter of Rossikon. Unfortunately there are no twelfth-century documents from his foundation, nor any account of its origin. But the surviving, still-inhabited Monastery of Koutlounousios (or Mone tou Koutlounousiou) rises in the fertile center of the Athos peninsula, a few minutes' walk south of Karyes. It is probably the most permanent memorial of a Turk who entered Byzantine service in this period.¹⁸

Perhaps in the 1130s, probably before 1143, Michael Italikos had an acquaintance, perhaps an ex-

brother) in belittling Manuel at Melangeia (Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 127–28) was John Axouchos, that the latter was indeed a supporter of Isaac, and that Axouchos was the one punished by Manuel, by loss of (the privilege of bearing) the imperial seals. But everywhere else Axouchos is given his correct title of grand domestikos by Kinnamos. There is no evidence that Axouchos had ever had custody of the seals. If it was Axouchos who was belittling Manuel, why did Andronicus verbally attack the Sebastokrator? Why was Isaac punished by temporary exclusion from the imperial presence? If Manuel had been in the slightest degree suspicious of John Axouchos, he would have done far more than remove the seals from him. As it was, Axouchos was clearly high in the emperor's favor. He appears repeatedly in command of troops in 1146–50, after the affair at Melangeia: see below. I am grateful to Prof. Magdalino for an offprint of his study, but I prefer the suggestions of F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène (1118–1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143–1180)* (Paris, 1912), 215 note 6.

¹⁶Nicholas of Methone, *Πρὸς τὸ μέγαν δομέστικον*, ed. A. K. Demetrakopoulos, *Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, I (Leipzig, 1866; repr. Hildesheim, 1965), 199–218 (quotation from p. 200); J. Dräseke, "Nikolaos von Methone," *BZ* I (1892), 471–73. Italikos' letters are cited in note 13 above; Basilakes, *Orationes*, 84–91. The fragment of an oration published *ibid.*, 116–19, which Garzya thinks may have been part of the speech addressed to Axouchos, and to fit on p. 89 of his edition, has no reference to Axouchos. Rather, it is addressed to an emperor who has created a navy, is involved with Russians, Serbs, peoples of the steppe, Turks, Germans, and above all, Sicilians, and whose speech is capable of winning support by the force of its eloquence. The author is probably not Basilakes, and the emperor sounds more like Manuel than John or Alexius.

¹⁷Barzos, *Γεν.*, I, 278–80 (no. 53), 288–91 (no. 57); Balsamon, commentary on canon 69 of St. Basil, in *Σύνταγμα τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, ed. G. A. Rhalles and M. Potles (hereafter Rh.-P.), IV (Athens, 1854), 226–27. The career of John Axouchos is discussed by P. Gautier, in Italikos, *Lettres et discours*, 41–44, but his version of the stemma of Axouchos' family must be corrected by comparison with Barzos, *Γεν.*, I, 280 note 7, and 288. Birth dates are tentative, largely based on marriage dates and an assumption that girls married at about age 14. The fullest study on Axouchos is K. M. Mekios, *Ὁ μέγας δομέστικος τοῦ Βυζαντίου Ἰωάννης Ἀξούχος καὶ ὁ πρωτοστράτηγος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἀλέξιος* (Athens, 1932), 15–35, but he did not have available Italikos' letters or the speech by Basilakes, although he was aware of their existence (p. 33). By mistake, Mekios, pp. 27–28, makes Axouchos participate in the attack on Antioch in 1144, a confusion with Prosouch—see below.

¹⁸P. Lemerle, *Actes de Kutlumus*, Archives de l'Athos 2 (Paris, 1946), 4–5; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 171. The most recent contribution to the question of Koutlounousios' origin is D. Nastase, "Les débuts de la communauté oecuménique du Mont Athos," *Κέντρον Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν, Σύμμεικτα*, 6 (1985), 263–67.

student, with a Turkish name, Tziknoglos or something similar, in which the final syllable represents the Turkish -oglu, "son of." Tziknoglos is addressed as "dearest brother," and Italikos inquires about his sister's health. The existence of a sister argues that Tziknoglos was the son of a Turk who had married in Byzantium. Tziknoglos has been utilizing a magician or sorcerer to heal his sister; Italikos simultaneously protests horror at this and claims to know thoroughly such "Chaldaean" magic, but not to use it. In another letter he alludes to Tziknoglos' high admiration for the grand oikonomos, the administrator of Haghia Sophia's revenues. Possibly Tziknoglos was a former student of Italikos and had obtained a position within the clergy of Haghia Sophia.¹⁹

Among the officers who served their military apprenticeship under John II was Prosouch or Borsuq, who is stated by Kinnamos to have been "a Turk by birth, but who had shared in a Roman [i.e., Byzantine] upbringing and education."²⁰ Shortly after Manuel's accession, in 1144, the emperor dispatched an expedition against Raymond of Antioch. Command was given to the brothers Andronicus and John Kontostephanos, but they were apparently youthful and untried, for Manuel attached to them Prosouch, stated to be experienced in warfare. A few pages later, Kinnamos refers to this army as "those with Prosouch,"²¹ thus suggesting that the Turk was the real commander of the expedition. The campaign enjoyed some successes. In 1147, at the time of the advance of the Second Crusade, Prosouch commanded a force sent to observe the German Crusaders as they marched through Thrace. Nicetas Choniates would have us believe that Prosouch negotiated with them and was substantially responsible for the achievement of peace between the Byzantine and German forces. While Prosouch is not again mentioned, he evidently married, for a son or grandson, Nicephorus Prosouchos, was praitor or gov-

ernor of Hellas in the reign of Andronicus I; he left favorable recollections in the mind of Michael Choniates, metropolitan of Athens.²²

If the careers of most Turks hitherto noticed are fairly clear, that of Poupakes presents chronological problems. The name evidently derives from "Abu-Bakr," a not-uncommon Muslim one. Poupakes first appears as an aide to Manuel in 1146, during the retreat from Ikonion. He assisted the emperor in making forays and laying ambushes for the fast-moving Turkish cavalry, but also counseled Manuel against excessive rashness.²³ In 1149, during the siege of Kerkyra, Poupakes, then a member of the bodyguard of the grand domestikos, Axouchos, volunteered to ascend the ladder which had been erected against the wall. Crossing himself, he mounted first and reached the battlement just before the ladder collapsed and precipitated those behind him into the sea. Isolated, he frightened off the defenders and leapt out through a postern door, back to his companions.²⁴ Ca. 1164 Poupakes, specified to be the person who had distinguished himself at Kerkyra, was in the service of Andronicus Comnenus, Manuel's cousin, later emperor. When Andronicus escaped from prison, Poupakes met him at Anchialos and furnished him guides and supplies to continue his flight. Arrested by Manuel, Poupakes was flogged and paraded around as an example of the fate of traitors; he proudly protested his loyalty to his master.²⁵ So far we have a consistent picture of an individual distinguished by bravery and devotion. A difficulty arises because Kinnamos reports that in 1160–61, during a winter campaign, the emir of Sarapata Mylonos (perhaps Sandikli, southwest of Afyon), dispatched his nephew Poupakes to in-

The author argues that, as the price of recognition of his sultanate within the Byzantine Empire in 1081–82, Sulayman of Nikaia was constrained to found a monastery on Mount Athos, with a relative, probably a brother, as founder. This thesis is a tissue of suppositions, without documentary evidence.

¹⁹ Italikos, *Lettres et discours*, 201–3 (no. 31), and 227.4 (no. 38). In both letters, the spelling of the last syllable of the name is unclear; the abbreviation could be resolved "Tziknoglos," "Tziknogles," "Tziknogalas," or "Tziknogoulos." Only the Greek form "Tziknopoulos" is clearly ruled out, according to Gautier.

²⁰ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 73.

²¹ Ibid., 33, 35.

²² For Prosouch's career, see Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 33–35, 71–73, 77; Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 52, 64; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 257; Barzos, *Гев.*, I, 292 note 9. Unlike "Axouch-Axouchos," Prosouch's name is always treated as indeclinable. The argument of Barzos, op. cit., that Prosouch was a possible relative of the Borsuq or Bursuq who served the Seljuk sultans of Persia in invasions of Anatolia (Cahen, "Première pénétration," 44, 50–51) is unfounded: the name is common. On Nicephorus Prosouchos, see Michael Choniates, *Tὰ Σωζόμενα*, ed. S. P. Lampros (Athens, 1879–80; repr. Groningen, 1968), I, 142–49; II, 54, 66. In the text of the letters, Nicephorus is always called "Prosouch"; only in the lemma of the oration addressed to him (I, 142) is he called "Prosouchos," and the Laurentian MS reads "Prosouch" (ibid., note).

²³ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 48–50; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 256–57.

²⁴ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 83–85. It is not certain that the Poupakes of 1146 and the Poupakes of 1149 are the same, but Manuel in 1149 was evidently well acquainted with Poupakes. In 1146 Poupakes might already have been in the service of Axouchos, who participated in that expedition.

²⁵ Ibid., 130–32.

investigate whether Manuel was at the head of the Byzantine force. This Poupakes, who was thoroughly familiar with Manuel, came up and spoke to him.²⁶ That this was the same Poupakes, entering Turkish service for a brief period after Axouchos' death (soon after 1150) and then returning (after 1161) to Andronicus' service, is improbable, because Andronicus was in prison from ca. 1155 to ca. 1164. Thus Andronicus was unlikely to have been in a position to hire retainers, much less secure the intense personal allegiance Poupakes showed in 1164. Poupakes probably entered Andronicus' service between 1150 and 1155, and the person of that name among the Turks in 1160–61 is someone else.²⁷

During Manuel's reign, a certain Nicephorus Chalouphe gained some importance; the name comes from Turkish Halife, Arabic Khalifa, meaning caliph. Chalouphe may have been the son of a Turkish immigrant, since no source mentions his Turkish background. He first appears in 1147, when he signally failed in his defense of the Acrocorinth against a Norman expeditionary force. Nicetas Choniates presents the Norman commander as berating Chalouphe for failing to defend so naturally strong a fortress. Possibly about 1162/3, Chalouphe was married to Theodora Comnena, daughter of Manuel's sister Eudokia and her husband Theodore Batatzes; Theodora had been Manuel's mistress. Probably Chalouphe's background as an outsider, even of foreign descent, made him a desirable husband for Theodora. In the next years he executed a number of commissions with success. About 1164 he was sent as commander beyond the Danube into Hungary, to act with the Byzantine nominee for the Hungarian throne, István or Stephen IV, against his rival István III. When he realized that his protégé lacked support, Chalouphe cleverly extricated his forces and István IV was constrained to follow him back to Sirmion. In 1165 or early 1166, Chalouphe was dispatched as an envoy to Venice, to win the support of members of the Lombard League against Frederick Barbarossa. The subsidies he had to offer reinforced the will of the north Italian cities to oppose the German emperor. About 1166 Chalouphe was appointed *doux* or governor of Byzantine Dalmatia, but was abandoned by his own

troops and captured by a Hungarian army advancing into the region. In 1167 Manuel sought Chalouphe's release, and perhaps obtained it when the Hungarian wars momentarily halted in that year. But nothing further is heard of Nicephorus Chalouphe.²⁸

During Manuel's reign, the most prominent Turk, or half-Turk, was Alexius, the son of the grand domestikos John Axouchos. (The sources do not call him Alexius Axouchos, but evidently the name "Axouchos" remained in the family, and it is convenient to use it to distinguish him from his many homonyms.) At some point, Alexius Axouchos wedded Maria, only child of Alexius Comnenus, eldest son and designated successor of John II. Barzos believes the marriage occurred about 1141; if so, John II presumably approved it in order to reward John Axouchos' faithful service and bind his family more closely to the dynasty. Alexius Axouchos would scarcely have been considered the eventual heir to the throne, as there was still hope that Alexius Comnenus might have a son and there were numerous other males among John II's direct descendants. Byzantium had no notion of primogeniture, or even of a hereditary throne, and females were considered only in case of default of male claimants from the imperial family: Zoe and Theodora, the last members of the Macedonian house, are the exemplary case. If the marriage of Alexius Axouchos and Maria occurred after Manuel ascended the throne, Manuel probably intended it as a disparaging match for Maria, to prevent her being allied to some powerful family who might use her as a pretext for usurpation. While Alexius Axouchos was not technically disabled from holding the Byzantine throne, his Turkish background was never forgotten and created hostility to him. A marriage arranged by Manuel seems slightly more probable than one sponsored by John II.²⁹

²⁶ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 196–97.

²⁷ On Andronicus' imprisonment, see *ibid.*, 130, 232–34; Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 101, 103–8, 129–32. He had escaped briefly in 1158, but this flight was too short-lived to allow Andronicus time to enlist Poupakes in his service.

²⁸ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 75–76; Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 225–26, 228–31, 248, 263, 265 (because Kinnamos deals with topics and regions, his presentation of Chalouphe's career may not be chronological; possibly Chalouphe was appointed *doux* of Dalmatia before being sent to Venice); Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 339; Barzos, *Γεν.*, II, 417–34 (esp. 430–34) (no. 150). Barzos, *Γεν.*, II, 417 note 3 (on p. 418) suggests that the text of William of Tyre, *Hist.*, RHC HOcc, I, 1070 (ed. Huygens, II, 1013), "Alexius quoque protostrator, Theodore Calusine neptis domini imperatoris, filius" be emended to read "Theodora Chalufinae," but Byzantine wives did not ordinarily take their husbands' names; there seems no MS warranty for altering two letters. The Old French translation does not include her name.

²⁹ On the marriage, see Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 103, 144–45; K. Barzos, 'Ἀλέξιος Κομνηνός—Εἰρήνη ἡ Ῥωσική καὶ οἱ ἄντχοι

Alexius Axouchos first appears at Pelagonia when ca. 1154/5 he reported to the empress Bertha-Irene a plot by Andronicus Comnenus to assassinate Manuel. Alexius was already protostrator, one of the highest military titles, but one which carried only such responsibilities as the emperor chose to assign. Alexius was apparently a capable military leader, and is stated to have been popular with soldiers and officers, but his real skills would seem to have been in diplomacy. In 1157 he was sent to Italy on a delicate mission. Simultaneously he was to wage war on the Normans of Sicily and engage in peace negotiations with their king. He was eminently successful: after a treaty had been concluded, he covertly removed the army's pay and left behind sealed weighted money-chests for his mercenaries. Ca. 1165 he was sent as governor to the surviving Byzantine lands in Cilicia; Kinnamos would have us believe that en route he stopped at Ikonion and negotiated with the sultan, with whom the Byzantines were then at peace. In Cilicia, although he was militarily unsuccessful, he did open discussions with the Armenian Church which led to efforts at Armeno-Byzantine reconciliation. In the next year, 1166, we find Alexius Axouchos as co-commander of a Byzantine force on the Hungarian frontier.³⁰

In 1167 Alexius Axouchos accompanied Manuel on another expedition against Hungary, but at Sardika (Sofia) he was arrested, convicted, and imprisoned in a monastery on Mount Papykion. Nicetas

Choniates (a youth at the time) alleges that Alexius was the victim of the paranoia which beset all emperors and forbade them to leave unharmed an upright, prosperous individual. The specific charges against Alexius Axouchos, according to Nicetas, included sorcery (flying invisibly to attack his foes). His chief accuser was Isaac Aaron, an unsavory individual later punished for magical practices and for subverting imperial policy in his role as interpreter. About Manuel's motives, Nicetas is more specific. The emperor feared lest Alexius Axouchos was destined to succeed him; the Byzantine populace had noted that the initials of the first Comneni, Alexius, John (Ioannes), and Manuel, were AIM so the next emperor's name must commence with an "A," to make AIMA or "blood." Alexius' name fitted the sequence, and his marriage to Maria linked him to the dynasty. Manuel was also alarmed at Alexius' popularity among the soldiers and officers, and even, because of his generosity, among the people. Finally, Nicetas suggests that Manuel was greedy for the protostrator's wealth, most of which was confiscated. The historian considers the charges unfounded, the action of an arbitrary tyrant, and depicts Alexius Axouchos as devotedly loyal. By the time Nicetas wrote, Manuel was long dead and the Comneni dynasty had been displaced.³¹

John Kinnamos, who composed his history during the reign of Manuel's son Alexius II, with a strongly laudatory view of Emperor Manuel, charges Alexius Axouchos with varied crimes: (1) on his way to Cilicia, in 1165, he had treasonable converse with Kilidj Arslan II in Ikonion, and exchanged letters with him to obtain his support for usurpation; (2) thereafter he had murals showing the sultan's deeds painted on the walls of his suburban mansion; (3) he repeatedly met with a Latin wizard to discuss Manuel's lack of a male heir, and received drugs from the wizard to maintain this condition; (4) he made treasonable statements to Constantine Doukas and Kasianos, who reported his words; and (5) at Sardika he induced Cuman

ἀπόγονοί τους, Βυζαντινά 7 (1975), 137–39; Barzos, Γεν., II, 117–18 (no. 123) (largely reproduces his article). Barzos' date, ca. 1141, is apparently based on the probable ages of the couple. Barzos' view that if Alexius Comnenus (d. 1142) had lived and ruled, Alexius Axouchos would have been the empire's second personage and heir apparent, contradicts Byzantine ideas. Alexius Comnenus had a second wife, from whom sons might have been expected. Even without sons, it would have been difficult for Alexius Axouchos to obtain recognition as heir, in view of the difficulties Manuel I experienced in obtaining recognition for Béla-Alexius, his intended son-in-law: Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 137. That John II arranged Maria's marriage in the interval between Alexius Comnenus' death (1142) and his own (8 Apr. 1143) is unlikely; he was preoccupied with his campaign in Cilicia.

³⁰Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 97–98; Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 129–30, 170, 227, 260, 268. In regard to the negotiations with the Armenian Church, see Barzos, Γεν., II, 125–26. Barzos, *ibid.*, 124, has Alexius Axouchos meeting Baldwin III of Jerusalem at Mamistra in 1158, but William of Tyre's text suggests Alexius Comnenus, later protosebastos. Barzos, *ibid.*, 118 note 9, is certainly right to suggest that Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 227.17 should be corrected from πρωτονοταρίου to πρωτοστράτορος; protostrator is a most unlikely office for Alexius, who is elsewhere always called protostrator, even on his seal: Barzos, *ibid.*, 118 note 8.

³¹Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 143–46, 427. Nicetas does say that at his arrest Alexius Axouchos was snatched from his wife's arms. Possibly this is rhetorical exaggeration. Perhaps the protostrator had a mansion in or near Sardika; the region was relatively secure in the mid-12th century. Or, just possibly, Maria was allowed to come part of the way on the campaign: Empress Bertha-Irene had been with Manuel at Pelagonia, and in 1175 the child Alexius (II) accompanied Manuel I on the expedition to reconstruct Dorylaion: P. Wirth, *Eustathiana* (Amsterdam, 1980), 78. That he had his wife with him speaks against Kinnamos' allegation of a planned assassination of Manuel that night.

mercenaries to attack Manuel's tent. Supposedly Manuel had repeatedly reproved Alexius Axouchos for his disloyal actions: when a page of Alexius reported the planned assassination of the emperor to Manuel's eunuch Thomas, the emperor had to proceed against him. The eunuch Thomas, John Doukas, Michael the logothete, and Nicephorus Kaspax drew up charges, to which Alexius Axouchos at once pleaded guilty. He threw himself on the emperor's mercy.³²

The two accounts are sharply opposed, in detail as well as in their views of the truth of the accusation. Kinnamos' allegations must be taken to represent the propaganda of the victorious faction in a court intrigue; Nicetas perhaps exaggerates Alexius Axouchos' virtues, but his depiction of an innocent man is more convincing than Kinnamos' allegations. For instance, the claim that Alexius Axouchos conspired with the sultan seems improbable: either he visited Ikonion as a private citizen and held covert discussions with the sultan, a fact which could scarcely have escaped the emperor's spies, or he was in Ikonion on official business. The alleged paintings either never existed or have been misinterpreted by Kinnamos: to flaunt the sultan's achievements, and his own Turkish sympathies would have been acts of someone seriously out of touch with reality. The same can be said of the treasonable words. The charges involving sorcery, echoed in both Nicetas (who derides them) and Kinnamos (who believes them), were banal in twelfth-century Byzantium. To credit Kinnamos' account is to see Alexius Axouchos as publicly acting in a self-destructive fashion; Nicetas more convincingly shows him as the victim of a faction at court, and of the necessarily unsleeping suspicion of a Byzantine ruler.³³

According to Nicetas, Alexius Axouchos had formerly led a very luxurious life, and had been rather casual about observation of the forms of Christianity, especially the fasts. He now threw himself into monastic life with wholehearted enthusiasm, and died as exemplary a monk as he had been a soldier, courtier, and diplomat. For his wife,

Maria Comnena, matters went otherwise. She was at first distraught, and attempted suicide—a rare occurrence in Byzantium. Frustrated in the effort, she threw herself at Manuel's feet and besought mercy for her husband with tears and lamentations. Unable to move him, Maria wore out the short remainder of her life in fruitless grief.³⁴

Manuel I's followers included Turks in low-level positions of command and responsibility. Ca. 1154/5, at the time of one of Andronicus' plots against the emperor, the empress Bertha-Irene sent Isach or Ishāq to lead a group of three hundred soldiers to protect Manuel from the trap Andronicus had prepared. This Isach is stated to have been of barbarian birth but greatly favored by the emperor. Later, in 1175, there appears a Michael Isach, who had formerly served in Manuel's household, perhaps the same person. At that time, the emperor was engaged in reconstructing forts on the Turkish frontier; he dispatched Isach to punish deserters from the Byzantine army. Kinnamos would have us believe that Michael Isach cruelly exceeded his commission, and came close to being harshly punished by Manuel. He escaped at that time, only to perish miserably later, before Kinnamos wrote his history in 1180–81. Isach's descendants were stated to have been imperiled by his disaster, but evidently survived.³⁵

Several other officers are known from brief references. In 1156, when a Byzantine force was attacking Brindisi, a Norman relief-expedition advanced, led by the king. One of the Byzantine officers sent with a small force to hinder the Norman advance was Pairames or Bairam, stated to have been a Turk; he commanded Georgian and Alan mercenaries.³⁶ In 1165, on a campaign against the Hungarians, one of the subordinate commanders was John Ises (ʿĪsā), who is explicitly stated to have been born a Turk but to have had a Byzantine education.³⁷

The son of Alexius Axouchos, John Comnenus, called "the Fat," was reared in poverty. He apparently gained some standing at the court of the Angeli, where he appeared among the witnesses to a synod in 1191. But he was far from prominent. In

³² Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 265–69. The persons Kinnamos mentions, together with Isaac Aaron, probably belonged to the faction opposed to Alexius Axouchos.

³³ It would not be necessary to discuss at such length the relative merits of Nicetas' and Kinnamos' stories, except that Barzoz, in *Ἀλέξιος Κομνηνός—Εἰρήνη ἢ Ῥωσική*, 145–60, and in his *Γεν.*, II, 127–34, has accepted many of Kinnamos' charges and striven to interweave them with those in Nicetas to produce a single story. Mekios, *Ὁ μέγας δομέστικος* (see note 17 above), 35–36, is much more cautious about Kinnamos' assertions.

³⁴ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 144–46. Nicetas presents Alexius Axouchos and his wife as an ideal couple; the events occurred while the historian was a youth, and we must beware of his retrospective romanticizing.

³⁵ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 129–30, 298–99; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 140.

³⁶ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 167; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 243.

³⁷ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 238; Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 141.

July 1200 he became the nominal leader of a conspiracy against Alexius III; he seems, however, to have been only the puppet of ambitious malcontents. His forces easily occupied the Great Palace, but John could only drink while his supporters pillaged. The emperor's guardsmen regained control of the palace, and John was slain as he fled. In an oration by Euthymius Tornikes, which celebrated Alexius III's triumph, the usurper's Turkish origin became the occasion for bitter aspersions against him. The line of Axouchos did not terminate with the disaster of John Comnenus the Fat: the third emperor of Trebizond was John Comnenus Axouchos. Possibly the wife of Alexius I of Trebizond was a daughter or niece of John the Fat, and so the name came into the family.³⁸

A number of other persons have been suggested as being Turks who entered Byzantine service. In 1082 Anna Comnena records the arrival of a Turkish contingent from Nikaia led by Kamyres, who is stated to have been older and more experienced than the other Turkish leaders. In 1095 a Kamyres, identified as "a certain Turk," served as the executioner who blinded Pseudo-Diogenes. The second Kamyres is probably not the same person as the distinguished Turkish general of 1082. The issue has been further confused, however, by P. Gautier, who argued that in the case of the first individual, instead of "Kamyres," the reading "Kamytzes," offered by the manuscript of the epitome of Anna Comnena's *Alexiad*, should be adopted. Thus, he says, this Turkish officer remained in Byzantium and was the ancestor of the distinguished Kamytzes family. But the manuscript of the epitome is comparatively late, thirteenth-fourteenth century, and has little weight against the twelfth-century manuscripts of the full-length version of the *Alexiad*. There is no evidence that the officer Kamyres remained in Byzantine service.³⁹

³⁸ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 526–28; Euthymius Tornikes, Speech to Alexius III, "Les discours d'Euthyme Tornikès (1200–1205)," ed. J. Darrouzès, *REB* 26 (1968), 66–67; Barzos, Ἀλέξιος Κομνηνός—Εἰρήνη ἢ Ῥωσική, 160–75; see my *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 122–24, but for the correct date, see J.-L. van Dieten, *Niketas Choniates: Erläuterungen zu den Reden und Briefen nebst einer Biographie* (Berlin, 1971), 123–28.

³⁹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 23, 201; P. Gautier first asserted the identification in "L'obituaire du typikon du Pantocrator," *REB* 27 (1969), 240, 256–57; he slightly modified his view in "Le synode des Blachernes" (see note 9 above), 259–60. On the slight value of the MS of the epitome, see B. Leib, introduction to Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, I, clxiv. Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 148, has no suggestion about the name Kamyres; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 158–59, believes the Kamyres of 1082 and his homonym of 1095 were different persons.

A number of other individuals may have been Turkish. In 1083 one of the commanders of the Turks whom Sulayman of Nikaia supplied to Alexius I for use against the Norman invader was Migidenos. He participated in fighting Bohemund's army at Larissa. Ca. 1089 he reappeared in Alexius' campaign against the Petchenegs in Thrace, where he died of wounds.⁴⁰ A Byzantine officer named Tzitas was associated with Tatikios in aiding the First Crusade's attack on Nikaia (1097). In 1101 he commanded the Tourkopouloi or half-Turks, who accompanied Raymond of St. Gilles on the ill-fated march of the Crusade of 1100–1101 into Paphlagonia. Together with Raymond, he escaped the disaster and returned to Constantinople. Possibly Tzitas was Turkish.⁴¹ Other officers may likewise have been Turks or part Turks.⁴²

Various Turkish rulers made visits to Byzantine emperors; I shall briefly note some and discuss an important one at greater length. After a defeat in 1116 Kilidj Arslan I's son Shahanshah (sultan of Ikonion, 1107–16) went to Alexius I's camp to make peace. A rebellion by Shahanshah's brother Mas'oud was brewing; despite warnings from Alexius, Shahanshah elected to return to Ikonion. Mas'oud's forces intercepted and blinded him en route.⁴³

Mas'oud (sultan 1116–55) soon found himself at odds with another brother, 'Arab, and ca. 1125–26 had to flee to John II. The Byzantine emperor, according to Michael the Syrian, welcomed Mas'oud and furnished him money. 'Arab, who failed to take Ikonion, fled when Mas'oud advanced with Danişmendid aid. 'Arab first sought Armenian help, then turned to the emperor, but perished among the Byzantines, ca. 1126–27. No Byzantine source reports on these events, but John II's reign is very thinly chronicled.⁴⁴

Sultan Kilidj Arslan II (1155–ca. 1192) made peace with Manuel I and in 1162 paid a visit to Constantinople. He was received with extraordinary honors, although the populace took occasion to jeer at the Turks. The sultan desired to enter

⁴⁰ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 30, 107–8; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 212–13.

⁴¹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 12, 37–38; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 300, suggests he was Turkish.

⁴² One such was Chouroup or Chouroupes, attested from 1146 to 1150: Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 44, 87–88, 98, 101, 105–6. None of these three officers is listed in Moravcsik, *BT*.

⁴³ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 204–13; Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, tr. J.-B. Chabot, III (Paris, 1905), 194–95.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 223–24.

Haghia Sophia, but a fortuitous earthquake allowed the patriarch to prevent what he considered an abomination.⁴⁵

In the 1170s, refugees from Kilidj Arslan's aggressive advance began to gather around Manuel. The sultan's brother, another Shahanshah, who had been expelled from Ankyra and Gangra, was joined by the Danişmendid prince Dhu' l-Nun. Both received Byzantine assistance to regain their territories, ca. 1175–76, but neither succeeded.⁴⁶

The longest-resident and most important of the Turkish refugee princes was Ghiyath al-Din Kay Khusraw I. He was the youngest son of Kilidj Arslan II, by a Christian wife, and enjoyed his father's special favor and the consequent enmity of his brothers. Ca. 1194–95 he took possession of Ikonion, and severely ravaged Byzantine lands. But around 1197, his elder brother Rukn al-Din seized the Turkish capital and Kay Khusraw was driven to flight. After wanderings which apparently included an early visit to Constantinople, then refuge in Cilician Armenia and northern Syria, Kay Khusraw returned ca. 1200 to Alexius III. Everywhere, he seems to have been honored, but nowhere did he obtain assistance against his powerful brother. Ibn Bibi preserves an account of how Kay Khusraw intervened in a quarrel between a Frankish mercenary and the emperor, but the story seems to have been exaggerated. What is more certain is that he was baptized, apparently with the emperor standing sponsor for him. He wedded a daughter of Manuel Maurozomes; she became the mother of Kay Kubad I. The connection was a valuable one to Kay Khusraw in several respects. His bride's grandmother was apparently an illegitimate daughter of Manuel I, so that Comnenian blood entered the Seljuks of Ikonion. Also, his marriage won him the support of a powerful Byzantine family. According to Akropolites, Kay Khusraw left Constantinople along with his godfather Alexius III in 1203, but other accounts say Kay Khusraw lived with his father-in-law Maurozomes. If he did abandon Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade, he probably took refuge with the Maurozomes family.

In 1205, after his brother Rukn al-Din's death, Kay Khusraw was recalled to Ikonion. With the help of eastern emirs he regained the position of sultan. His second reign endured until 1211. Be-

cause Alexius III's daughter Anna was his spiritual sister, Kay Khusraw assisted her husband Theodore Lascaris to establish himself in Bithynia. He also aided his father-in-law Manuel Maurozomes to create a buffer state in the central Maiander Valley. When war broke out between Lascaris and Maurozomes, the sultan assisted in making peace between them, assuring Maurozomes a territory. The Maurozomes family remained prominent in Ikonion during the thirteenth century. Kay Khusraw was more fully integrated into Byzantine society than any other Turkish prince.⁴⁷

Despite the prominence of Kay Khusraw in Constantinople at the outset of the thirteenth century, the period after the battle of Myriokephalon in 1176 evidences fewer Turks in Byzantium than previously. In part, this may be because with 1176 we lose the help of Kinnamos as a source and must rely on Nicetas Choniates alone. Kinnamos identifies more military commanders of the second rank than does Nicetas, and it was at that level that most Turks served. Nevertheless, Alexius Axouchos and Nicephorus Chalouphe were the last persons of Turkish descent prominent in the upper levels of Byzantine society. Perhaps Manuel Comnenus was more interested in attracting western Europeans into his service. Certainly after Myriokephalon, Byzantium ceased to be able to compete for dominance in Anatolia, and Turks no longer saw great rewards in becoming Byzantine.

The most numerous element of Turks in Byzantine service consisted of large, anonymous masses of soldiery, but they are also the most elusive, and we can say very little about them. After Mantzikert (1071), Michael VII and Nicephorus III were reduced to seeking the "alliance" of raiding bands of Turks, alliances which really amounted to hiring them to fight against a specific foe of the government. Thus the dangerous rebellion of Roussel de Bailleul was defeated by securing the services of Artouch (Artuq) and later Touthach.⁴⁸ From engaging such bands for a single

⁴⁵ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 204–8; Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 118–21.

⁴⁶ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 291, 295; Michael the Syrian, *Chron.*, III, 357, 368–70.

⁴⁷ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 520–22, 626, 638; George Akropolites, *Historia*, ed. A. Heisenberg and P. Wirth (Stuttgart, 1978), I, 11, 14; [Theodore Skoutariotes], *Σύνοψις χρονική*, ed. K. N. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 7 (Venice and Paris, 1894; repr. Hildesheim, 1972), 454; Gregory Abu al-Faraj, called Bar Hebraeus, *The Chronography*, trans. E. A. Wallis Budge (London, 1932), I, 350; Ibn Bibi, *Die Seltshukengeschichte*, trans. H. Duda (Copenhagen, 1959), 21–31, 37–38; Barzos, *Fev.*, II, 499; Vryonis, *Asia Minor*, 230 note 515.

⁴⁸ Bryennios, *Hist.* (see note 7 above), 179–81, 187–89; Laurent, *Byzance et les Turcs*, 91–101.

action, it was but a step to enrolling larger forces for longer terms. Alexius I, soon after his accession, made a treaty with Sultan Sulayman of Nikaia, recognizing his boundaries. In return, the sultan supplied troops for the struggle with Guiscard, evidently on several occasions.⁴⁹ How many of these Turks, who fought in Europe, returned to Anatolia we cannot know, but probably some remained in Alexius' army and eventually settled. By the time of the First Crusade, the Tourkopouloi or sons of Turks formed a prominent part of the Byzantine army. Raymond of Aguilers defines them: "For they are called Turcopuli who either were nurtured among the Turks or spring from a Christian mother [and] a Turkish father."⁵⁰ Clearly this term covered full-blooded as well as half-breed Turks.

In addition to such mercenaries, the early Comneni captured many Turks and settled them inside the empire. After the passage of the First Crusade, Alexius took some two thousand Turks, whom he ordered to be scattered among the Aegean Islands.⁵¹ In a campaign about 1124, John seized numerous Turks, converted them, and made them a substantial addition to the Byzantine army; presumably they settled within the empire. When John took Gangra, the Turkish garrison was allowed to depart, but many chose to remain in Byzantine service.⁵² Under Manuel, according to a speech of Eustathius of Thessalonike in 1178, the captivity of numerous Turkish women and children attracted Turkish men to come over to the Byzantines. There were so many around Thessalonike, he said, that it might well be called "New Turkey, or the European land of the Turks."⁵³

Among the most dramatic documents relating to the Turks in Byzantium, one which directly concerns the recruitment of Turks, is an alleged auto-

biographical statement by Tzachas. About 1090–91, the pirate-emir was contending with Constantine Dalassenos on Chios, and came to parley with him. According to Anna Comnena, Tzachas addressed Dalassenos by name, and said, "Know that I was that youth who formerly overran Asia and, fighting enthusiastically, out of inexperience was captured by stratagem by the late Alexander Kabalikas. Then, when I had been brought captive by him to emperor Nicephorus Botaneiates, I was forthwith honored with the rank of the protonobellisimoi and deemed worthy of great gifts; I promised him service [*douleia*]. But from when Alexius Comnenus assumed the reins of empire, everything collapsed."⁵⁴ Tzachas continued with demands for reinstatement and requests for a marriage tie with Dalassenos' family.

Tzachas is presented as declaring that he entered Byzantine service as a consequence of being captured. Other Turks also followed the path of captivity into Byzantium. Tatikios' father had been taken prisoner by Isaac I's brother John Comnenus about the middle of the eleventh century, and the young Tatikios passed into slavery with him. At least, such is a possible explanation for the allegation that his nose had been removed. A number of emirs ("satraps," in Anna Comnena's terminology) were included among the captives whom Alexius I settled on the islands.⁵⁵ The most successful of the captives was certainly John Axouchos, taken by the First Crusaders at the time of the siege of Nikaia.⁵⁶

account of how Manuel paid slave-owners to liberate able-bodied slaves for incorporation into the army, and how newly captured groups were offered the choice of enslavement or military service; these included the Hagarenes (Muslims) as well as others. A portion of these captives must have been Turks. I am indebted to Prof. Richard Hamilton for his repeated assistance with this passage. Concerning it, see A. P. Kazhdan, "Odin netochno istolkovannyi passazh v 'Istorii' Ioanna Kinnama," *RESEE* 7 (1969), 469–73, esp. 473. On population exchanges in this period, see S. Vryonis, Jr., "Patterns of Population Movement in Byzantine Asia Minor 1071–1261," in his *Studies on Byzantium* (see note 50 above), no. VI.

⁵⁴ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 114. While Anna has certainly invented the words, the substance of the speech is probably correct. For this portion of the *Alexiad*, Anna's relatives Constantine Dalassenos and John Doukas seem to have been her sources. No special value would attach to falsifying the facts of Tzachas' service to Byzantium; Anna's readers could have verified the claims he made. Whether Tzachas' captor was an otherwise unknown Alexander Kabalikas or the well-known Alexander Kabasilas (S. P. Lampros, "Alexander Kabasilas," *BZ* 12 [1903], 40–41) is not important for our purposes. Savvides, *Τζαχάς* (see above, note 8), 14:21–22, translates this speech, but does not examine Tzachas' period of service in Byzantium.

⁵⁵ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 26.

⁵⁶ The exact place and circumstances of Axouchos' capture

⁴⁹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, I, 138, 146; II, 23, 134.

⁵⁰ Raymond of Aguilers, *Liber* (see note 9 above), 55; *Gesta Francorum*, 6, 16. Examples of Crusader usage could easily be multiplied. On the recruitment of Turks, see S. Vryonis, Jr., "Byzantine and Turkish Societies and Their Sources of Manpower," in his *Studies on Byzantium, Seljuks, and Ottomans: Reprinted Studies*, Byzantina kai Metabyzantina 2 (Malibu, Calif., 1981), no. III, 126–40.

⁵¹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 26.

⁵² Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 9, 15.

⁵³ Eustathius of Thessalonike, in W. Regel, ed., *Fontes rerum byzantinorum*, 1 (Petrograd, 1892–1917; repr. Leipzig, 1982, with introduction by A. P. Kazhdan), 77–79 (quotation from p. 79). I am indebted to Prof. Alexander Kazhdan for pointing out this citation. The literal Greek terms are "New Persia" and "Persians," but by this time these were conventional. A funeral oration for Manuel, by Eustathius, *Opuscula*, ed. G. L. F. Tafel (Frankfurt/Main, 1832; repr. Amsterdam, 1964), 200, has an

A number of other individuals may be suggested as possibly having begun as captives among the Byzantines. Prosouch and John Ises are both stated to have been Turks by birth but reared in Byzantium; they may have been captured as children.⁵⁷ The fathers of Tziknoglos and Nicephorus Chalouphe might have entered the empire in this way.

Of the voluntary enrollment of Turks in imperial service, we hear in general terms, but only occasionally in precise detail. "Siaous" was won over by Alexius' persuasions and generous offers. Alexius' success was made possible in that case by "Siaous'" Christian ancestry, and the like may have happened in other instances, since there was extensive intermixture in Anatolia. The emperor's effort was worthwhile because of the valuable letter "Siaous" bore. Elchanes, under Byzantine attack, agreed that he and his relatives would accept Alexius' offers and come over to the Byzantine side. When Skaliarios heard of Alexius' generosity, he followed Elchanes into the imperial camp.

Twice, apparently, captive Byzantines succeeded in wooing their captors to join them in flight to Byzantium. Manuel Comnenus (Alexius I's elder brother) discovered that Chrysoskoulos was in difficulties with the sultan and pointed out to him that he could never succeed in his ambition to become sultan himself unless he secured Byzantine aid. Despite the ensuing defeat at Mantzikert, Chrysoskoulos remained true to the Byzantine cause. Anna Comnena and Zonaras both report the escape of Eustathius Kamytzes from Turkish captivity ca. 1113. In Anna's version, he simply fled during the confusion of a running battle with Alexius' troops. Zonaras, however, declares that he persuaded his captors to flee with him to the emperor, who welcomed them with gifts. Since Anna is imprecise about how Kamytzes actually got loose, it is possible that Zonaras gives the full story.⁵⁸

must remain slightly doubtful. Both Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 9, and Basilakes, *Orationes*, 87, specify that he came from Nikaia, but the city was surrendered directly into the hands of Alexius' generals, so that the Crusaders had no opportunity to take prisoners there. Perhaps he was seized while escaping Nikaia, in a skirmish, or in a neighboring fortress.

⁵⁷ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 73, 238.

⁵⁸ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 167–68, 170–71; Zonaras, *Epitome* (see note 8 above), III, 756–57; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 83–85. Anna (III, 168) reports that the principal Turkish emir (archisatrapes) Mouchoumet was acquainted with Kamytzes. The latter had been governor of Nikaia, and they could have encountered one another in the course of raids or in truce negotiations.

Reasons why Turks voluntarily joined Byzantium are not difficult to find. Some came because they were defeated in internal struggles, or felt threatened by powerful Turkish foes. Sultans of Ikonion and other Turkish rulers in Anatolia, temporarily excluded from power, turned almost spontaneously to Constantinople, and Kay Khusraw I stayed long enough to be integrated into Byzantine society. Only unexpected developments brought him back to Ikonion. Others were attracted to Byzantium by the gifts offered by the emperor. Skaliarios is depicted as rushing to share in Alexius I's lavish generosity to Elchanes and his relatives. While it is difficult to believe that Byzantine gifts and the salaries which went with titles exceeded the profits of plunder in Anatolia, the receipt and enjoyment of them might be more secure and long-lasting. We should not overlook the attractions of urban life and "civilized" luxury for Turks who were scarcely more than a generation removed from central Asia.

Several considerations which would seem to us to have hindered Turkish enlistment in Byzantine service had little force in the eleventh-twelfth century. The Turks' adhesion to Islam was evidently not very deeply ingrained. Only a few generations had elapsed since the Ghuzz Turks had become Muslim. Some of those born in Anatolia had Christian mothers, others were familiar with Christians of various sects and had grown up in an atmosphere of relative tolerance. No sense of Turkish "nationalism" or even ethnic solidarity troubled Amertikes, Elchanes, or others who came to fight for Byzantium. The Turks continuously fought one another; there was no reason not to do so and get paid for it. Finally, if we ask why any intelligent Turk would abandon rising Turkish power to join dying Byzantium, we must consider that the empire, at least from 1081 to 1176, did not seem on the verge of collapse. Whatever symptoms of internal decay the historian may detect, Byzantium under the Comneni preserved a splendid facade. The emperors were capable, even (in Manuel's case) magnificent individuals, success followed upon success, the gold hyperper was the standard of the Mediterranean, and wealth enough to hire mercenary armies and reward great generals was available in the treasury. Only with the defeat at Myriokephalon, and under the weak successors of Manuel I, was the attraction of Byzantium for its Turkish neighbors shattered.

Of the various activities Turks carried out within the Byzantine Empire, the greatest interest attaches to the role of two who served as playfellows

of future rulers. Of course, Tatikios was not chosen as a companion to an emperor-to-be; Alexius Comnenus was the third son of a cadet branch. He was presumably destined for a military career, and by the 1060s it was obvious that the Turks were going to be Byzantium's opponents on the eastern front for the foreseeable future. We do not know the exact age at which Tatikios and Alexius were brought together, but they were young enough that Tatikios could be called Alexius' *syntrophos*, indicating that they had grown up together.⁵⁹ The future John II and John Axouchos were ten years old at the time the Turkish captive was made a companion for the future emperor. In this case, the choice was evidently purposeful: a Turk was chosen to grow up alongside a future emperor. Manuel, to the best of our knowledge, never received a Turkish or any other non-Byzantine companion as *syntrophos*. But he was a fourth son, not an emperor designate, and his succession was unanticipated.

One reason for providing youthful Turks to Alexius and John Comnenus as companions may have been to give them some knowledge of Turkish. As a military commander, Alexius would constantly be in contact with Turkish mercenaries as well as Turkish opponents. His two elder brothers were at one time or another captured by the Turks. For John, as a future emperor, not to have to rely on interpreters was obviously important. Both Tatikios and John Axouchos as youths probably spoke Greek as well as Turkish: if Tatikios was born after his father's entry into the elder John Comnenus' household, this would be certain. Axouchos came from Nikaia, or near it; the city had been in Turkish hands since at least 1081, possibly earlier. If Axouchos was ten in 1097, he may have been the offspring of a Greco-Turkish union; in any case, some knowledge of Greek would have been normal in a city which had recently become Turkish. Thus the young people could have communicated from the beginning.

Another reason for utilizing a Turk of unfree status as a companion for a young Comnenus was that the lad had no connections in Byzantine society. Both Tatikios and John Axouchos grew up to become intensely loyal supporters of the Comnenian house; Axouchos seems to have been the most trusted companion of John II, deeper in his councils than any other. Such a relationship with the emperor raised the individual to the highest peak of the court hierarchy: other members of the no-

bility dismounted to do reverence to Axouchos. The danger of a future emperor having a childhood companion who came from within the established nobility is evident in the case of Manuel. His cousin Andronicus Comnenus is stated to have been reared alongside the future ruler, and they had shared in athletic competitions of every kind.⁶⁰ However badly Andronicus might behave, Manuel could never forget their past association and could rarely mete out the punishment Andronicus deserved. Alexius and John II had been more fortunate in their companions.

But of the numerous Turks who entered Byzantium, only a couple occupied the position of play-fellow for a future officer or ruler. The largest number were utilized as soldiers or military commanders. The background of the nomadic Turk prepared him for fighting or herding, but little else, and the Byzantines recruited Turks for their martial abilities. Most Turks whom we know by name were commanders: Amertikes, Tatikios, Elchanes, Skaliarios, Prosouch, and many more. In a few cases where the fact is not specified (Chrysoskoulos, Tzachas), their backgrounds allow us confidently to hypothesize positions of command. They often led foreign mercenaries because of the diminished numbers of native troops. Turks commanded Turks, but also we find Pairames in charge of Alans and Georgians alongside Ioannakios Kritopoles, who appears to have been Greek.⁶¹ In addition to officers we encounter an individual or two who served as a military aide or bodyguard. Pou-pakes is first seen close to the emperor, then specified to be a guardsman of John Axouchos, and finally appeared in the service of Andronicus Comnenus. Michael Isach had commenced his career as a favored member of the imperial household before being sent to round up deserters.

A handful of Turks, many of them second generation, engaged in non-military activities. "Siaous" arrived as an envoy from the Turks; after completing a delicate task in Pontus for Alexius I, he was appointed governor of Anchialos. While Alexius Axouchos commanded troops, his greatest ability seems to have been as a diplomat. He successfully executed a difficult mission in Italy, and opened friendly relations with the Armenian Church; he may have visited Ikonion to negotiate with the sultan. Nicephorus Chaloupes is first encountered as governor of Corinth, a position

⁶⁰ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 127: the expressions are close to those used about Tatikios.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 167.

⁵⁹ Bryennios, *Hist.*, 289.1.

which was evidently an entirely civil one, for he showed no military abilities or experience in defending the Acrocorinth. Later he succeeded as Byzantium's ambassador to Venice. Prosouch's son or grandson Nicephorus Prosouchos served as the civil governor of Greece. Tziknoglos seemingly enjoyed a rhetorical education and entered the bureau of the oikonomos of Hagia Sophia. Finally, Koutloumousios perhaps integrated himself more deeply into Byzantine culture than any other Turk, by becoming a monk and founding a monastery on Mount Athos.

The court was the focus of Byzantine social life, and a number of Turks had major roles there. Tatikios was in personal attendance on Alexius I when he frustrated Diogenes' plot. John Axouchos was wise enough to decline the gift of Anna Comnena's property and arrange its restoration to her, thus earning a reputation for fairness and avoiding the hostility of an important faction. Alexius Axouchos, despite his abilities as a diplomat, fell victim to an intrigue of his rivals. His son John was never more than a courtier, and foolishly allowed himself to be the front for an ill-conceived conspiracy. Nicephorus Chalouphe can be considered the quintessential courtier, becoming the husband of the emperor's mistress. Kay Khusraw I became so well established as a member of the court that he supposedly intervened in a quarrel between Alexius III and a Frankish mercenary and later fled from Constantinople in that emperor's company.

In the introduction of an individual Turk into Byzantine society, the necessary first step was baptism, whereby the individual abandoned his old, sinful, misbelieving life and was reborn a new person, free of sin, and (supposedly) believing in the truths of Orthodox Christianity. Since adhesion to Christianity was the primary qualification for participation in Byzantine life and the receipt of the benefits thereof, those Turks who elected to enter Byzantine service showed no hesitation about accepting baptism. "Siaous" first carried out his agreement to secure Sinope for Alexius, then returned and received baptism. Elchanes, Skaliarios, and their followers were baptized, and Anna Comnena credits Alexius I with an intention to convert the whole East (Persia, Egypt, and Libya, in her terminology) to Christianity.⁶² Poupakes, as he was about to ascend the ladder at Kerkyra, made the sign of the cross. Koutloumousios, who became a monk, must be considered the most thoroughly Christian of these Turks.

⁶² Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 81; see *ibid.*, 66, on "Siaous."

Several circumstances made conversion (and specifically baptism) comparatively easy for Turks to accept. First, as we have stated, Islam was new to them, and in the eleventh-twelfth centuries they evinced few signs of fanaticism. Second, in Anatolia they were intermingled with a population still overwhelmingly Christian. In fact an interesting text reveals that baptism was in use among Turkish Muslims there during the twelfth century. Balsamon, writing late in that century, recorded an incident from the patriarchate of Loukas Chrysoberges, 1157–69/70:

In the days of the holy patriarch lord Loukas, Hagar- enes appeared in the synod and, being required to be baptized, said that they were previously baptized in their lands. And being asked how, they responded that it was customary that all the infants of the Hagar- enes were baptized by Orthodox priests. But they were not accepted, for they [the members of the synod] had heard that the baptism sought from Christians by the godless [Muslims] was not sought in good conscience and upright purpose, but for the sake of bodily healing. For it was deemed by the Hagarenes that their children would be subject to demonic possession and stink like dogs, unless they enjoyed Christian baptism; therefore they did not appeal for baptism as the purifier of every spiritual stain and giver of holy light and sanctification, but as a medicine or charm. But some of them said they had Orthodox mothers, and by their endeavor were baptized by Orthodox. But not even these were harkened unto, because there were no witnesses at hand attesting this. Rather, they were rejected, because they had not given a good presumption that they had correctly entered the faith. Therefore it was decreed that all these be baptized.⁶³

While the text evidently exaggerates the universality of baptism for Muslim infants in Anatolia, it shows that the rite was familiar to some of them. Acceptance of at least the outward forms of Christianity was evidently not difficult.

A special case of more than passing interest is represented by Tzachas. He must have been baptized when he entered Byzantine service in the reign of Nicephorus III. Various considerations demonstrate this assertion. He accepted a court title from the emperor, and pledged allegiance (*douleia*) to him. Admission to the hierarchy of the court presupposed membership in Christianity and his promises of loyalty would only have been accepted if they were oaths of a Christian. Again, when he fled from Constantinople, he is explicitly

⁶³ Balsamon in Rh.-P., II (1852), 498; see Vryonis, *Asia Minor*, 179 note 267, 441–42. These Hagarenes or Muslims appearing before the synod must have been some of the numerous ones mentioned in the orations of Eustathius of Thessalonike: see note 53, above.

stated to have secured assistance from a Byzantine (i.e., Christian) shipwright (and his workmen) in the construction of his fleet. He thus gained more cooperation from the native inhabitants than any other Anatolian Turkish emir of that turbulent period. Arguably, he was able to present himself to the people of Smyrna as a Christian, a rebel general not significantly different from Roussel before him. Then, during his discussion with Constantine Dalassenos, Tzachas requested a marriage between their offspring. The terminology is such that one cannot tell which family was to provide the groom, which the bride; we do know that Tzachas had a daughter who then or later wedded Kilidj Arslan I, and possibly a son, the "Tzachas" who appears after the death of our Tzachas. In any case, Tzachas must have known, from his period in Byzantine service, that the marriage would be impossible except between Christians. Finally, Tzachas claimed the imperial throne for himself: "calling himself emperor, he used the symbols pertaining to emperors and, inhabiting Smyrna as if [it were] a palace, he prepared a fleet to ravage the islands again and come up to Byzantium itself and be carried to the very throne of the empire, if possible."⁶⁴ His pretension to the Byzantine throne would be unthinkable if he could not at least claim to be Christian. Without this primary qualification he would have been unable to attract support; if he had taken Constantinople, he would have been utterly unacceptable to the Byzantines save as a Christian.

Tzachas' Christianity was barely skin-deep, and the same is probably true of a good many others who entered Byzantine service as adults. Tzachas easily returned to the Turkish world, and undoubtedly remained Muslim so far as his Turkish followers were concerned. Kay Khusraw, whose conversion was apparently no more profound than Tzachas', also experienced no difficulty in reestablishing himself among the Turks of Ikonion. Given the intermingled state of Anatolian populations,

and the cross-cultural usage of baptism attested by Balsamon, passage between the two religions was comparatively easy. Presumably in the case of boys incorporated into Byzantium at a youthful age, the depth of acceptance of Christianity was comparable to that of native Byzantines. John Axouchos certainly attests full belief and a rather profound understanding of Christianity. His questions to Nicholas of Methone show some reading in Gregory of Nazianzen, and go beyond idle curiosity. Koutloumousios, founder of a monastery, was apparently imbued with Christian ideals.

After baptism, Turks were integrated into Byzantine society through the reception of titles and the incomes and gifts which accompanied them. Indeed, from the Turkish point of view, the wealth the emperor could offer was a primary motive for abandoning the free life of a raider and becoming a Byzantine. Anna Comnena's account of Skaliarios and his unnamed companion is explicit: when they learned how much Elchanes and his family had received, they hastened to enjoy the like.⁶⁵ From the Byzantine point of view, the grant of a title was even more important. A title of honor gave an individual a recognized position within the ladder of court dignities, superior to some, inferior to others. Social status and recognition followed. One of the most valuable aspects of a title, so far as the emperor was concerned, was the possibility of promotion to another title. Once a Turk had received a title, with its appropriate salary, he would be anxious to obtain another one, higher up the ladder. Thus he would be encouraged to render loyal service.

Rewards for service could include landholdings. Nicetas Choniates complains that state-owned properties, together with the peasants working on them, were turned over to foreign mercenaries, including half-barbarians (*mixobarbaroi*), for exploitation. That the Turks received such grants is indicated by Eustathius of Thessalonike. After having been attracted into the empire, he says, "They do not possess property by verbal warranties alone, but by documents, on which hang golden finials, the imperial seals."⁶⁶ Such imperial documents, chrysobulls, were the means by which formerly tax-paying lands were transmitted to their new holders.

Baptism, ranks, and rewards were the first steps

⁶⁴ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 158; on his title, oath, and plans for intermarriage, see *ibid.*, 114; on the Christian aid he gained, *ibid.*, 110. Tzachas' "Turks" were able to speak Greek well enough to call on God and hail the emperor in that language (*ibid.*, 111); perhaps a number were actually Byzantines who (like the master shipwright mentioned above) had enlisted under the pirate-emir. Alexius Comnenus was able to convince Kilidj Arslan I that Tzachas' real goal was the sultanate of Nikaia (*ibid.*, 165–66). Tzachas thus remained a Muslim so far as the Turks were concerned, while presenting himself as a Christian when it suited his convenience. Kurat, *Çaka Bey* (see note 8 above), does not discuss this problem. Savvides, *Τζαχάς*, 14:14, thinks Tzachas called himself emperor of Smyrna; he does not discuss the probability of Tzachas' having been baptized.

⁶⁵ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 81.

⁶⁶ Eustathius of Thessalonike, in Regel, *Fontes* (see note 53 above), I, 78; Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 208–9, who specifically mentions the imperial documents which granted fields and peasants to newly enrolled soldiers.

in integrating adult Turks into Byzantium; for young ones, education was equally important. Kinnamos says of Prosouch that he was "a Turk by race but one who had shared in a Byzantine nurture and education."⁶⁷ He makes a nearly identical statement about John Ises. Evidently Tatikios and especially John Axouchos had the same experience, and Axouchos put the intellectual aspects of this instruction to good advantage. The education of foreigners in Byzantium in the early twelfth century centered in the school founded by Alexius I in connection with the orphanage and retirement home at the Mangana. In it, Anna Comnena declares, Latin and "Scyth" (Petcheneg, Cuman, Russian?) studied alongside "Roman" (Byzantine) and Hellene youths. The Turkish boys who had been brought back captive from Alexius' last expedition into Anatolia (1114) were entrusted to this institution to be brought up as free persons.⁶⁸ The intent of this education was clearly to acculturate foreigners into Byzantium. How long the school at the Mangana lasted is unclear. While we cannot point to any specific Turks trained at that school, Tziknoglos had received an advanced rhetorical education, since he could understand the letter Michael Italikos, perhaps his former teacher, addressed to him.

The fullest stage of incorporation into Byzantine society was represented by intermarriage. Turks generally did not bring their families with them when they entered Byzantium, although Eustathius reports that Manuel I's seizure of Turkish women and children had caused male Turks voluntarily to pass over into Byzantine service.⁶⁹ The individuals who came as slaves, refugees, or recruits into the empire had to find spouses as best they could, according to their personal circumstances. If the young Tatikios was taken captive with his father, he probably had a Turkish mother; if he was born after his father's enslavement, his mother was probably a fellow slave. We know nothing about the wives of many of these Turks, but some of them did marry, as witness the descendants of Tatikios, John Axouchos, the father of Tziknoglos, and Prosouch. It would have been interesting to know whether the emperor arranged marriages for such new arrivals in Byzantium as Elchanes, Skaliarios, and Prosouch. Intermarriage

bound a Turk more deeply into Byzantine society, supplementing baptism, rewards, and titles.

We do have information about the marriage of a few individuals, and in these cases the emperor was directly involved. Alexius Axouchos, a second-generation Turk, married the daughter of the emperor-designate Alexius Comnenus. This union certainly required the consent of the reigning emperor, whether John II or Manuel I. While the marriage tied the family of Axouchos closer to the dynasty, it also diminished Maria Comnena's claim to the throne. Even so, the relationship did not spare Alexius Axouchos from the emperor's suspicion. The marriage of Nicephorus Chalouphes, probably a second-generation immigrant, to Manuel's former mistress was certainly arranged by the emperor. By this marriage, Chalouphes rose from relative obscurity to a position which led to important posts as governor, envoy, and military commander. Only his unfortunate captivity cut off his promising career. The wedding of Kay Khusraw I to the daughter of Manuel Maurozomes connected the exiled sultan to the Comneni; it probably required the consent of Alexius III. Kay Khusraw apparently cared enough about his wife that he took her to Ikonion on his restoration—otherwise, he would not have defended the interests of his father-in-law. His second successor, Kay Kubad I, was the offspring of this marriage.⁷⁰

By contrast, no Turkish women married into the dynasty or, so far as is known, into other aristocratic families. Maria of Bulgaria, Piroska-Irene of Hungary, Katae of Georgia, Bertha-Irene of Sulzbach, and Marie of Antioch are but a few of those of foreign descent who wedded Byzantine nobles or rulers. Byzantine princesses married Crusader kings and western rulers. To the Turks, cross-cultural marriage was within the realm of possibility: Malikshah requested a bride from the family of Alexius I,⁷¹ and Tzachas desired intermarriage with the family of Constantine Dalassenos. But only those Turks who became assimilated by baptism and residence in Byzantium obtained Byzantine brides.

The number of Turks who entered Byzantine service cannot be known. The figures which Alexander Kazhdan developed for the ruling class in Byzantium in the eleventh-twelfth centuries permit a statement regarding the Turkish proportion at that level of society. Even incorporating such

⁶⁷ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 73; for the statement on John Ises, see *ibid.*, 238.

⁶⁸ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 214, 218.

⁶⁹ Eustathius, in Regel, *Fontes*, I, 77–78. Exceptionally, Elchanes is specified as having brought his relatives with him.

⁷⁰ Barzos, *Гев.*, II, 499.

⁷¹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, II, 65, 75–76.

temporary residents as Amertikes, Tzachas, and Kay Khusraw, the total reaches only twenty-three, or just one percent of the 2,300 individuals Kazhdan surveyed. For comparison, Kazhdan found ten to fifteen percent of the ruling class to be of Armenian origin, although many of these families were thoroughly Byzantinized. The greatest numbers of Turks in high positions are attested in the 1070–1100 period and in the reign of Manuel I, although this distribution may in part be due to the nature of the sources. Even though the number of Turks and their descendants was small, some of them reached positions of great trust and influence.⁷²

When we consider the impact the Turkish immigrants had on Byzantium, we must ask about knowledge of their language. Specifically, it has been argued above that Tatikios and John Axouchos were selected as companions for Alexius Comnenus and his son in order to impart some knowledge of Turkish. As military commander or emperor, Alexius and John did not require a thorough knowledge of Turkish: the imperial bureau of translators could handle formal negotiations. But for battlefield use, to give commands to Turkish mercenaries, receive information from Turkish scouts, and interrogate prisoners, a working knowledge of Turkish would have been desirable. Such an elementary knowledge a ten-year-old such as Axouchos would have been able to convey to his high-born playfellow. There is, however, no textual evidence that Alexius I or John II understood Turkish. But twice Manuel I is shown conversing with Turks. In the final phase of the disastrous retreat from Ikonion in 1146, the emperor caused a Turkish soldier to be summoned by shouts. Kinnamos presents Manuel as speaking directly to this Turk, entrusting him with an arrogant message for the sultan.⁷³ Again, ca. 1160–61, when Manuel was invading the region of Sarapata Mylonos, the emir sent his nephew Poupakes to investigate the situation. Poupakes rode up, dismounted, and approached the emperor. Manuel spoke to him and gave him proud words to take back to the emir.⁷⁴ In neither case is the language specified, but no

interpreter is mentioned. It is possible an interpreter was used, or the Turks in question may have understood Greek—although the Turk in 1146 seems to have been a totally random individual. But there is also the possibility that Manuel spoke Turkish.

Knowledge of Turkish at lower social levels would seem to have been very slight. In the reign of Alexius I, Anna Comnena mentions only Monastras and Rodomir (more correctly, Radomir Aaronios) as knowing Turkish. Monastras was a *mixobarbaros*, probably half-Cuman, and so knew a Turkic language from birth. Rodomir, Anna reports, knew Turkish well because he had long been captive among them.⁷⁵ There were other returned captives in Byzantine society—Eustathius of Thessalonike has a story of how a group escaped thanks to the aid of St. Demetrius, and the Turkish soldiers settled within the empire must have spread some knowledge of the language.⁷⁶ Andronicus Comnenus probably learned some in his long wanderings in Turkish lands. But only after 1453 was spoken Greek influenced by Turkish.

Among the unexpected aspects of the effects of Turkish culture on Byzantium was a Persian or Turkish-style building constructed within the Great Palace in the eleventh or twelfth century. Called the Mouchroutas (from *mahruta*, Arabic, Persian, and Turkish for cone or dome), it was situated just west of the Chrysotriklinos, from which it was reached by a monumental staircase. The stair seems to have been adorned with multi-colored tiles made in cross-shapes. On the stair or in the chamber were representations of “Persians” in their varied costumes. The domed ceiling of the great chamber had, apparently, stalactite decoration, set with gold mosaic. The brilliance and color of this building must have been extraordinary. The exact date of its construction is uncertain. It did not exist at the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; the description occurs in connection with John Comnenus Axouchos’ usurpation and death in 1200. Manuel I and Isaac II have been suggested as possible patrons of the building. The wealth of the empire under Manuel, and the ties

⁷² Kazhdan, *Sotsial’nyi sostav* (see note 12 above), 101, 200–218; A. P. Kazhdan, *Armiāne v sostave gosподstvennogo klassa vizantiiskoi imperii v XI–XII vv.* (Erevan, 1975), 146–47, 167–68. The count includes: 5 Tatikioi, 3 Axouchoi, 3 Prosouchoi, Amertikes, Chrysoskoulios, Tzachas, Elchanes, Skaliarios, “Siaous,” Koutlounousios, Tziknoglous, Chalouphe, Pairames, Tzitas, and Kay Khusraw.

⁷³ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 58–59.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 196–97. That this Poupakes (Abu Bakr) was probably

not the same as the guardsman in Byzantine service has been shown above.

⁷⁵ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 15. On Monastras, see Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 192; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 213–15. On Rodomir, *ibid.*, 274–75.

⁷⁶ Eustathius of Thessalonike, In praise of St. Demetrius, *Opuscula*, 173–74.

with the Seljuks of Ikonion which then existed, suggest Manuel's reign as the more probable date. The visit of Kilidj Arslan II in 1162 may have been the occasion or the inspiration of the construction of the Mouchroutas. While there is no surviving Seljuk architecture from the twelfth century, there were certainly mosques and a palace in Ikonion. Probably any Muslim artists and architects brought to Constantinople for the construction of the Mouchroutas passed through Ikonion, even if they were Persian or Syrian in origin.⁷⁷

The evidence of the Mouchroutas suggests that the Turkish and Byzantine worlds should not be seen as self-contained units, frozen into perpetual hostility. Rather they formed a continuum, with poles at Constantinople and Ikonion, between which persons and ideas flowed fitfully, as occasion allowed. The flow was not one-directional and not all Turks who came to Byzantium remained there. Amertikes returned to Muslim service in north Syria when pay for his soldiers was cut off. Tzachas, deprived of title and reward at the accession of Alexius I, shaped a career as a thalassocrator. Kay Khusraw, after having established a place for himself in Byzantine society, returned to Ikonion when fortune summoned him.

Did Turks in Byzantium retain contact with their compatriots in Anatolia? Certainly, those at the beginning and end of the period, Amertikes and Kay Khusraw, did. Chrysoskoulos was able to negotiate on familiar terms with Sulayman. Tzachas, who was only in the Byzantine Empire for a few years, evidently had not broken his ties with his fellow Turks. That "Siaous," Elchanes, Skaliarios, Pro-souch, or others who joined after Alexius I's accession and before Myriokephalon kept up contact is doubtful. Youthful captives such as Tatikios and John Axouchos almost certainly did not. On the other hand, Alexius Axouchos, a second-generation Turk in Byzantium, was charged by Kinnamos with having maintained a treasonable

correspondence with the sultan. In all probability the accusation was unjust. In many cases, however, a Scotch verdict must be returned on this question.

Although this investigation is devoted to the question of Turks who came into Byzantium, the reverse aspect, Byzantines who passed over to the Turks, cannot be totally ignored. A number of prominent Byzantine nobles took refuge temporarily among the Turks. John II's brother Isaac fled in company with his son John ca. 1130, and passed through the courts of Gumushtegin Ghazi ibn Danişmend, Leo I of Cilician Armenia, and Mas'oud of Ikonion, before returning to Constantinople.⁷⁸ Isaac's younger son Andronicus also spent a lengthy exile in Syria and eastern Anatolia; he ended that period of his life as a raider under the protection of the Saltuqid emir of Erzerum.⁷⁹ But the most celebrated and permanent deserter from Byzantium was Isaac Comnenus' elder son John. After having accompanied his father on his wanderings, he was reconciled with John II. Then, during the latter's siege of Neokaisareia (Niksar) in 1139, John quarreled violently with the emperor and fled to the Turks. He declared himself a Muslim, settled at Ikonion, and married a daughter of the sultan.⁸⁰

But most adherents to the Turks were of lesser rank. Michael the Syrian reports that ca. 1129 a Kasianos (the name is one known in twelfth-century Byzantium) surrendered his fortress in Pontus to Gumushtegin Ghazi and became his subject.⁸¹ The most important of Byzantine landholders to enter Turkish service were members of the Gabras family, who held extensive lands in the interior of Pontus. While the family remained prominent in Byzantium, one branch of it sought employment with the sultans of Ikonion. A Gabras, said to have been of Byzantine descent, but raised among the Turks, was captured and executed by Manuel I during the retreat from Ikonion in 1146. Another Gabras acted as Kilidj Arslan II's envoy to Manuel before and after Myriokephalon.⁸² After 1185, a series of pretenders who claimed to be Al-

⁷⁷Nicholas Mesarites, Λόγος ἀφηγηματικὸς, ed. A. Heisenberg, *Die Palastrevolution des Johannes Komnenos* (Würzburg, 1907), 44–45, 72, trans. in Cyril Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453: Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), 228–29, with the alteration suggested in note 235, which is evidently preferable. See P. Magdalino, "Manuel Komnenos and the Great Palace," *BMGS* 4 (1978), 101–14 (esp. 105, 108–9); Moravcsik, *BT*, II, 203; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*² (Paris, 1964), 122; Lucy-Anne Hunt, "Comnenian Aristocratic Palace Decoration: Descriptions and Islamic Connections," in Michael Angold, ed., *The Byzantine Aristocracy: IX to XII Centuries*, BAR International Series 221 (Oxford, 1984), 138–56, suggests that Greek and Arabic craftsmen cooperated on the Mouchroutas.

⁷⁸Michael the Syrian, *Chron.*, III, 230–31; Barzos, *Γεν.*, I, 239–43 (no. 36). Isaac probably also visited the Holy Land; he apparently returned to John II ca. 1138.

⁷⁹Andronicus' career is well known, but see Barzos, *Γεν.*, I, 517–30 (no. 87), on this period of wandering, ca. 1163–78.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, I, 480–85 (no. 84).

⁸¹Michael the Syrian, *Chron.*, III, 227.

⁸²C. Cahen, "Une famille byzantine au service des Seldjuquides d'Asie Mineure," *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth (Heidelberg, 1966), 145–49; A. Bryer, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos* (London, 1980), Parts IIIa and

exius II gained assistance from sultans of Ikonion and other Turkish rulers. While they did not intentionally seek service under the Turks, they effectively aided the Turks in their renewed advance in Asia Minor.⁸³ During the latter part of the century, as insecurity and abuses of tax-collection grew on the Byzantine side of the frontier, the Turkish sultan, by liberal grant of tax exemptions, attracted Byzantine peasants to settle on his lands.⁸⁴

While refugees, opponents, and would-be rivals of the emperor formed part of the traffic from Byzantium to Ikonion, there is evidence of a handful of other persons, including a few merchants, who made the journey. We know of a Latin (probably a Venetian trader) who was capable of introducing a pretended Alexius II to the sultan.⁸⁵ Amongst these travelers there went, apparently, confidential agents of the emperor. Manuel Comnenus, in particular, allegedly paid large sums of money to a handful of the greatest men in the sultan's court. Thus, when Kilidj Arslan II triumphed to the point of being able to annihilate Manuel's army at Myriokephalon, these advisers influenced the sultan to hold back and make peace.⁸⁶ Manuel's encouragement of a pro-Byzantine faction in Ikonion exactly parallels what he did elsewhere, especially in fostering supporters in the Italian city-states. It is possible that Manuel sent his messages through some of the humbler Turks in his service: Michael Isach, John Ises, and the like.

The advisers of the sultan who favored Manuel included, but probably were not limited to, Christians. J.-L. van Dieten, in his annotations to the *History* of Nicetas Choniates, added sentences from the hitherto unpublished Tomos 26 of Nicetas' *Armor of Dogma*. These say, in part, "A certain Emir Hasan, having been adopted by Gabras, who

was very powerful with Kilidj Arslan, sultan of the Turks in our times, approached our blameless faith, but while being instructed he heard the words of this anathematization [of Mohammed's god] [and] was no little displeased, inasmuch as God the maker of all was slandered by the Byzantines and subjected to anathema. Then, sending to the emperor—this was Manuel Comnenus—and presenting in a statement the things in the catechism at which he hesitated, he seemed to say things which did not disagree with what was right."⁸⁷ Brief as it is, this text offers several important details. The Gabras mentioned was certainly Kilidj Arslan II's envoy to Manuel before and after Myriokephalon (1175–76); that he remained a Christian was previously unknown. Hasan ibn Gabras was an important person in Kilidj Arslan's court in the sultan's later years; he twice served as ambassador to Saladin. That he was an adopted son of Gabras had not been known. That he became a Christian at the time of his adoption, and was able to communicate his difficulties to Manuel, are illuminating details. Probably Gabras and his adopted son were not totally isolated in the court at Ikonion. With some confidence, one may hypothesize around the sultan a small group of Christian advisers who were in contact with Manuel and probably received funds from him. That Hasan felt no hesitation about apostasizing from Islam (technically a crime punishable by death), in a way which could scarcely have escaped the sultan's notice, suggests the tolerant atmosphere of that court.⁸⁸

The date of Hasan ibn Gabras' conversion would seem to have been about 1179, for his complaints about the catechism stirred Manuel to his last ma-

IIIb. The Gabrades mentioned are Bryer's nos. 6 and 9. At the start of the 13th century, the Maurozomes family entered Turkish service, for the reasons indicated above. See Vryonis, *Asia Minor*, 229–34, for an excellent summary of Byzantines who voluntarily entered Turkish service.

⁸³Brand, *Byzantium Confronts* (see note 38 above), 86–87, 135–36; J. Hoffmann, *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten im byzantinischen Reich (1071–1210)* (Munich, 1974), 39–43.

⁸⁴Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 494–95; Brand, *Byzantium Confronts*, 137.

⁸⁵Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 420. K. Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts*, II, *IstForsch* 31 (Berlin, 1976), 115–16, 204, knows of no caravansaries prior to 1200, but acknowledges that many of them succeeded Byzantine xenodochia. Some of the earliest caravansaries were on the route from Ikonion to Constantinople, others on the road west from Ikonion.

⁸⁶Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 188.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 213 ann. On the *Panoplia Dogmatike*, see J.-L. van Dieten, *Zur Überlieferung und Veröffentlichung der Panoplia Dogmatike des Niketas Choniates* (Amsterdam, 1970). The integral text of this work remains unpublished, but van Dieten has included in his notes to this section of the *Historia* all parts of Tomos 26 of the *Panoplia* which differ from or supplement the *Historia*.

⁸⁸On Gabras and Hasan ibn Gabras, see Bryer, *Empire of Trebizond*, IIIa, 180–81 (nos. 9 and 10 of Bryer's catalogue). Hasan ibn Gabras was murdered in 1192. In 1234 a Giovanni de Gabra, a Christian, served as the envoy of Kay Kubad I to the pope and to Frederick II (*ibid.*, 181, no. 12). We do not know his relationship to the above-mentioned Gabrades. Any surviving Christian descendants of Hasan ibn Gabras would have been joined after 1205 by members of the Maurozomes family, who continued to be Christian until the end of the 13th century. The Christian wives of the sultans probably assisted this group of prominent Christians at the court of Ikonion. These women seem to have had some influence. Kilidj Arslan II favored Kay Khusraw, his youngest son, child of a Christian wife. Kay Khusraw protected his Maurozomes relatives-in-law, and later sultans also had Christian wives.

jor theological effort, in the early months of 1180. The issue evidently struck a responsive chord in the emperor, probably not only because he desired to ease the difficulties of one convert in Ikonion, but because he wanted to smooth the path of numerous Turks within the Byzantine Empire who were becoming Christians. The Tomos which was finally published stated that the Muslims who were coming to be baptized hesitated in part because they “were very rustic and ignorant of literature” and did not understand the issue.⁸⁹ These phrases presumably did not refer to Hasan, but to humbler converts.

A Muslim who became Christian was required to repeat a lengthy denunciation of Islam, which included in its final portion “In addition to all these things, I anathematize the god of Mohammed, about whom it says that he is one god, a *holosphyros* god; he begets not, nor is begotten, nor is anyone like unto him begotten.”⁹⁰ The allusion is to the Koran 112:1–4, where the Arabic word *samad* (“unique” or “eternal”) was rendered *holosphyros*, “solid,” “compact,” “uniform throughout.” Would-be converts like Hasan apparently feared that they were condemning the true God, while Byzantine theology held that Mohammed’s god, being without the Logos and the Spirit (*pneuma*), was without reason and breath, so was only dead matter (*holosphyros*). To ease the path of Muslim converts, Manuel proposed to remove the condemnation of Mohammed’s god from the catechistical book. Spurred by his advancing illness, he acted precipitately, without consulting his theologians. The members of the Holy Synod, when they heard Manuel’s decree, reacted strongly against the implication that the god proclaimed by Mohammed was the true God. Eustathius of Thessalonike spoke in particularly violent terms. Manuel was forced into a series of compromises. In the final decree, issued in April 1180, the anathema against Mohammed’s god was removed, and a new one against Mohammed, his teachings, and all who followed them was imposed. In practice, however, no change occurred, probably because Manuel died soon after (24 Sept. 1180) and his opponents al-

lowed the decree to be forgotten. A text of it survives, but copies of the convert’s renunciation of Islam made after the twelfth century retain the previous phraseology.⁹¹

That Manuel made the effort to respond to the needs of converts to Christianity, in Ikonion and inside the empire, indicates the importance he attached to both groups of Turks. The sultan’s advisers had been crucial to his own survival at Myriokephalon, and Hasan was already powerful in Ikonion. The numerous Turks settled within Byzantium needed to be assimilated. The failure of his alteration in the catechism to endure beyond his death indicates the fading importance of the Turkish element within the empire. In part, their diminution was due to circumstances, but another aspect of their decline was the appearance of a group of Byzantines who were hostile to the Turks in imperial service.

There is no sign of animosity to such Turks in authors of the first half of the twelfth century; Anna Comnena, John Zonaras, and Michael Italikos all seem neutral or uninterested in the question. Nicephorus Basilakes, in his oration to John Axouchos, would have us believe he was extremely favorable, at least to John. Traces of antipathy begin to appear in the middle of the century. George Tornikes, metropolitan of Ephesos, complained, in a letter seeking the retention of his uncle in an official position, that barbarians, by nature slaves, were being raised above the Hellene, the lover of the Muses and of Hermes. In a funeral oration for Anna Comnena, he was more specific. Speaking about Anna’s parents, Alexius I and Irene, he said, “For many from these [remote ends of the earth], the greatest occasion for fame was only that they had been called their servants and had come into their presence under their authority and heard their commands, barbarians from captivity or even slaves bought from the sales-room of the market who were introduced into the palace—how much [greater] should it be for her [Anna] that she was engendered and nurtured by them.”⁹² The allu-

⁸⁹ J. Darrouzès, “Tomos inédit de 1180 contre Mahomet,” *REB* 30 (1972), 195. This article, plus van Dieten’s discoveries, substantially replaces K. G. Mpones [Bonis], “Ο Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐστάθιος καὶ οἱ δύο “τόμοι” τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Μανουὴλ Α΄ Κομνηνοῦ (1143/80) ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὴν Χριστιανικὴν ὁρθοδοξίαν μεθισταμένων Μωαμεθανῶν,” *Επ. Έτ.Βυζ.Σπ.* 19 (1949), 162–69.

⁹⁰ Darrouzès, loc. cit.; see also PG 140 (Paris, 1865), 133–34.

⁹¹ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 213–19, with the variants from the *Panoplia Dogmatike* given in the notes; Darrouzès, “Tomos inédit de 1180,” 187–97; A.-Th. Khoury, *Les théologiens byzantins et l’Islam: Textes et auteurs (VIII^e–XIII^e s.)* (Louvain, 1969), 187–93, 249–50; S. Vryonis, Jr., “Byzantine Attitudes toward Islam during the Late Middle Ages,” in his *Studies on Byzantium* (see note 50 above), no. VIII, 272–73, whose particularly clear presentation of the theology I have followed.

⁹² George Tornikes, in George and Demetrius Tornikes, *Lettres et discours*, ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1970), 235.4–8; see the letter to John Kamateros, *ibid.*, 129.1–10. Both date from ca. 1153 to

sion to those who have risen through slavery and service in the Great Palace must be to such Turks as Tatikios and John Axouchos.

The most virulent propagator of slanders against Turks of this type was John Kinnamos. In his history, written between Manuel I's death and the accession of Andronicus I, Kinnamos delights in denigrating such persons. John Axouchos is presented, in the description of the retreat from Ikonion, as being more interested in saving his own skin than in assisting the emperor or rescuing the army. Fearing his own capture, supposedly, he took some troops, who were on their way to aid Manuel, to form a bodyguard for himself at a spot he considered defensible. Later, Kinnamos blames Axouchos for failing to conduct a fleet he commanded to Italy. The historian alleges Axouchos was either corrupted by the Venetians or too inexperienced in naval matters to carry out his mission. Part of the fleet, he claims, was lost in a storm because Axouchos did not take appropriate precautions.⁹³ Against Michael Isach, Kinnamos fulminates at length, probably with exaggeration. In 1175 Isach was dispatched to punish deserters from Manuel's army. Supposedly he blinded everyone he met, whether runaway soldier, peasant, trader, or any other person. Isach's actions cannot have been excessive, for Manuel declined to penalize him, and indeed exonerated him from the accusations. Kinnamos, however, exhibits *Schadenfreude* in mentioning Isach's ensuing death and the disasters which overtook his descendants.⁹⁴

The fall of Alexius Axouchos afforded an occasion for Kinnamos to unleash the full extent of his anti-Turkish sentiments. He rejoiced in the opportunity to vilify the former protostrator, attributing to him a variety of political crimes, not to mention acts of unbelievable folly. Alexius is stated to have plotted with the sultan, placed unpatriotic paintings on the walls of his villa, conspired with a magician to impair the emperor's virility, made treasonable statements to a number of persons, disdained Manuel's efforts to correct him, and finally assembled a band of mercenaries to attack the emperor.⁹⁵ While Alexius Axouchos' over-

throw was primarily the result of a struggle for power within the palace (his judges presumably represent the victorious faction), it gave a moment of triumph to the anti-Turkish group.

Kinnamos' younger contemporary, the historian Nicetas Choniates, was free of enmity to the Turks. Nicetas, who wrote in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, avoids using the term "Perses" ("Turk") in connection with most individuals. He specifies John Axouchos as a "Perses" the first time he mentions him, but afterwards simply gives his title. Alexius Axouchos is called Alexius the eldest son of the grand domestikos, and thereafter, Alexius the protostrator. Other Turks or their descendants (Poupakes, Prosouch, Nicephorus Chaloupes, John Comnenus Axouchos, Constantine Tatikios) are not so designated. (Kinnamos, on the other hand, uses the term "Perses" in most such cases.) Nicetas was extremely favorable to John Axouchos and his son Alexius. He praised John's character very highly; indeed, Axouchos is one of the few personages who emerges as wholly admirable in Nicetas' lengthy history. Nicetas regards Alexius as a noble-minded man, pulled down by petty jealousies and the paranoia of the emperor.⁹⁶

The case of John Comnenus Axouchos "the Fat" allows an appraisal of the extent of hostility to the Turks in Byzantine service at the start of the thirteenth century. When his story was recorded, he was dead; as a fallen usurper, he was a "tyrant" in Byzantine terminology. There was no reason to spare him vilification; there was (in the immediate aftermath) every reason to flatter the triumphant Alexius III. We have five accounts of John's usurpation: Nicetas Choniates' *History*, written in final form after 1204, an oration by Nicetas, and orations by Nicholas Mesarites, Nicephorus Chrysoberges, and Euthymius Tornikes. All four speeches were composed shortly after the event. Nicetas' *History* contains no reference to John's Turkish origin, but mentions his Comnenian ancestry. Nicetas' oration declares that John was not pure-blooded, but, like ancient Ishmael, home-born of a noble stock. ("Ishmael" or descendants of Ishmael is a term constantly applied to Muslims.) Nicetas, however, introduces this only in passing. Nicephorus Chrysoberges avoids mentioning John's descent. Nicholas Mesarites holds back any allusion to that subject until the fugitive is depicted entering the Mouchroutas, when its construction by his grand-

1155. On the concepts of Hellene and barbarian, see K. Lechner, *Hellenen und Barbaren im Weltbild der Byzantiner: Die alten Bezeichnungen als Ausdruck eines neuen Kulturbewusstseins* (Munich, 1954).

⁹³ Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 51, 102.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 298–99.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 265–69.

⁹⁶ Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.*, 9–11, 97, 143–46.

sire's relative is noted. But his Turkish descent is not stressed.⁹⁷

While Nicetas Choniates, Chrysoberges, and Mesarites do not make a special point of John "the Fat's" Turkish ancestry, Euthymius Tornikes expatiates on the subject. Euthymius was the nephew of George Tornikes, and perhaps inherited his anti-Turkish feeling. He says:

Oh, that Turkish race, ill-intentioned, swollen, obdurate and stiff-necked like the Egyptians, as it was anciently spiteful against the Byzantines, raising conflicts against the Byzantines' realm and hostile to us from the beginning. For a descendant of that Turkish race, reared and nurtured here for his own evil fate—you know well that empty fellow, heavy-fleshed and useless, the graceless seed of Ishmael, whose God is his belly (I speak the divine and holy [word] according to Paul [Phil. 3:19])—he, although he was nigh the imperial race, although he had been warmed and nurtured in the merciful bosom of the emperor, yet he was not desirous to put aside his inborn baseness, the crooked serpent. A Turk is still a Turk—like an ape is an ape, according to the proverb—he did not reject his ancestral viciousness and haughty, Turkish spirit: "for eating he was filled and kicked, was fattened and broadened and forgot who nurtured him, and revolted from him" [Deut. 32:15, slightly altered], and like Jeroboam, another slave and rebel, assembling a foolish and unwise people, he usurped that great honor and renowned name, the empire.⁹⁸

The faction which opposed the Turks in Byzantine service, to judge by the material we have, was not numerous. The chief evidence for its existence is the writings of a number of rhetoricians and of the historian Kinnamos, a bureaucrat. The triumph of the group lay in the destruction of Alexius Axouchos; perhaps, indeed, the group began as a reaction to the high authority attained by John Axouchos, and the successes of his son. George Tornikes saw the Turks as upstarts, to be suppressed in favor of free-born, native Hellenes. Kinnamos highlighted the ancestry of every Turk, and denigrated John Axouchos and his son. Euthymius Tornikes seized an opportunity to ventilate his spleen in the most extreme language. Nevertheless, the size and popularity of the group

cannot compare with that of the opponents of the "Latins," especially of the Italian merchants. The Turks occupied high positions at court and thus attracted the jealousy of courtiers and of writers who hoped to win positions in the bureaucracy. There must have been thousands of Turks settled in the countryside, to judge by Eustathius' remarks about "New Turkey" and "European Land of the Turks," but they were not concentrated enough to attract widespread popular hostility. The Latins formed visible colonies in the cities, and their economic power injured a great many persons. Anti-Latin feeling was largely inarticulate, but expressed itself violently in the great Latin Massacre. Nothing so bad befell the Turks.

The Turks were only one of many peoples whose members (voluntarily or involuntarily) became part of Byzantine society in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Soldiers from England, Scandinavia, Normandy, France, Italy, Germany, and Russia voluntarily enlisted. Large numbers of Serbs and Hungarians were captured in the campaigns of John II and Manuel I and settled within the empire. Georgians and Armenians still appeared in Byzantine forces. The vast majority of Turks who entered Byzantium were humble persons, residing on the islands or in Macedonia, probably with military obligations. Because they were few compared to the total number of the population, and because there were many other ethnic groups within the empire, there was no great wave of popular hostility against them.

On the other hand, the number of Turks in the Byzantine army, and the high position of Turkish officers, probably contributed to the belief of Western Crusaders that the Byzantines were in alliance with the Turks. Tatikios was vilified by most of the historians of the First Crusade for his conduct at the siege of Antioch. Prosouch commanded the forces which strove to keep the Second Crusade in check. Hostility to Byzantium and suspicion of the emperors rose in the twelfth century, and the use of Turks contributed thereto.

Turks were not the only foreigners to ascend in the empire's service, and intermarry with the imperial family. John Rogerios, Boris of Hungary, and Renier of Montferrat were among the most prominent. But Alexius Axouchos surpassed them in wedding the only offspring of the emperor's eldest son. The Latins, Hungarians, and others who achieved high status in Byzantium and intermarried with the aristocracy or the reigning house generally came from noble or knightly back-

⁹⁷ Ibid., 526–28; Nicetas Choniates, *Orationes et epistolae*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten, CFHB 3 (Berlin, 1972), 104; Nicephorus Chrysoberges, *Ad Angelos orationes tres*, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1892), 1–12; Mesarites, *Palastrevolution*, 45. The lemma of Nicetas' speech (*Orationes*, 101) alludes to John the Fat's descent "from the Grand Domestikos named Axouch, who was Turkish," but it may have been written by the scribe.

⁹⁸ Euthymius Tornikes, Speech to Alexius III (see note 38 above), 66–67. I am grateful to Prof. Samuel Lachs for the citation to Deuteronomy (the reference in the edition is incorrect).

grounds. They arrived in the empire with a claim of outstanding descent to support their pretensions. Ancestry carried great weight in twelfth-century Byzantium: Anna Comnena could excuse her father's preference for the incompetent Aspietes (Oschin) on grounds of his descent from the Arsacids of Armenia.⁹⁹ Only a handful of Turks who entered Byzantium could claim status by birth: Amertikes, Elchanes, and Koutlounousios, for instance. But most of the Turks who gained leading roles in the empire were of obscure origin. Tzachas is explicitly stated to have been of undistinguished background. Servile beginnings or captivity did not bar advancement. Tatikios and John Axouchos owed their rise first to the fortune which brought them into contact with the future emperor, but most of all to their personal qualities. With no claim to noble ancestry, in competition with members of the Byzantine, Western, and other aristocracies, the Turks mounted through ability and loyalty to the emperor to positions of high command and great influence at court.

Indeed, the early Comneni probably turned toward the Turks exactly because they had no connections with the established aristocracy. "Siaous," Elchanes, Tatikios, and John Axouchos could all be

relied on because they lacked ties in society, and were totally dependent on the emperor's favor. Alexius Axouchos, however, possessed a link to the reigning dynasty which could be made to seem a potential threat to Manuel. Hence Alexius was cast down from his high position. Nicephorus Chalousphes' obscure Turkish origin probably made him seem appropriate as the husband of Manuel's former mistress. During the period of their greatest prominence, the Turks' lack of social connections made them valuable to the emperor.

Byzantium benefited by their presence. Tatikios, John Axouchos, and Prosouch were capable generals. Alexius Axouchos and Nicephorus Chalousphes managed diplomatic missions with delicacy and success. John Axouchos rose highest, as the emperor's principal adviser. The disappearance of loyal and capable Turks from positions of command and influence after Manuel's death left leadership to aristocrats with largely civilian backgrounds, and to eunuchs. The only Turks then in Constantinople, John Comnenus Axouchos and Kay Khusraw, acted as courtiers rather than leaders. In a letter to John Axouchos, Michael Italikos called him "an unshaken tower of the Romans' realm."¹⁰⁰ The empire was weakened by the disappearance of the Turks in Byzantine service.

Bryn Mawr College

⁹⁹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, III, 58–59; Skoulatos, *Personnages*, 29–31. On the Latins who entered Byzantine service, see D. M. Nicol, "Symbiosis and Integration: Some Greco-Latin Families in Byzantium in the 11th to 13th Centuries," *BF* 7 (1979), 113–35; Elizabeth Jeffreys, "Western Infiltration of the Byzantine Aristocracy: Some Suggestions," in Angold, *Byzantine Aristocracy* (see note 77 above), 202–10.

¹⁰⁰ Michael Italikos, *Lettres et discours*, 223.14–15 (no. 37), quoted at the beginning of this paper. On the nature of the elite from 1180 to 1204, see Kazhdan, *Sotsial'nyi sostav*, 263–64.